AN ENQUIRY INTO THE Validity of a late Diſcourſe, INTITULED The NATURE and DUTY Of SELF-DEFENCE.

Violare alterum lege Naturæ prohibemur.

CICERO *de Officiis*, Lib: 3.

See that none render Evil for Evil unto any Man, but ever follow that which is good, both among your ſelves, and to all Men. 1 Theſs. v. 15.

Philanthropus, pseud. K.

LONDON:

Printed and Sold by T. SOWLE RAYLTON and LUKE HINDE, at the *Bible* in *George-Yard, Lombard ſtreet*, 1747.

AN
ENQUIRY
INTO THE
Validity of a late Divorce,
INSTITUTED
The NATURE and DUTY
OF SELF-DEFENCE.

BRITISH MUSEUM

LONDON:
Printed and Sold by T. SOWER, RATCLIFF-
and LOWER HYDE, at the Bull in Cheapside,
2nd. Edition, 1743.

THE PREFACE

THE *prime and fundamental* Laws *of Nature were the* Dictates *of Divine Wiſdom, written on the Heart of Man, clearly diſcovering to him his* Duty, *rewarding his* Obedience *with* PEACE, *and leaving him, in Caſes of known* Tranſgreſſion, *ſelf-condemned and without Excuſe.*

Theſe Laws *continued to be an* unalterable Rule *of Man's* Conduct *thro' After-ages: To theſe the Apoſtle plainly alludes, when he ſays,* The *Gentiles* which have not the Law, do by Nature the Things contained in the Law; theſe having not the Law, are a Law unto themſelves, which ſhew the Work of the Law written in their Hearts.*

To the Obſervers of this Law, *the Apoſtle aſſigns* Glory, Honour *and* PEACE.† *In this* peaceful *State of willing* Obedience *was Man at firſt created; and had he remained therein,* PEACE, *the* Fruit of Righteouſneſs,‖ *had been his* perpetual Portion: *Thus ſtood Man in his* Original *Purity; in that*

 primitive

* Rom. ii. 14, 15. † Verſ. 10. ‖ James iii. 18

primitive *and* natural *Eſtate wherein* God *created him: A* State *of* perfect Peace *and* Tranquillity.

Strife, Diſcord, War *and* Deſtruction, *proceed from another* Root, *being the Conſequences of Men's* Sin *and* Diſobedience.

For, having firſt diſobeyed the Dictates *of that* Wiſdom which is from above, *which is* pure, peaceable, *and* gentle: Their fooliſh Heart was darkned, *and* profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe, they became Fools; * *deceiving themſelves with a falſe Appearance of* Wiſdom, *viz. that* Wiſdom which deſcendeth not from above, but is earthly, ſenſual, deviliſh, *producing* Envying and Strife, Confuſion, and every evil Work.† *Thus having forſaken the* God of Love and Peace, *Men became* hateful, and hating one another. ‖

But this State of Hatred, *is a State not of* Nature, *but altogether* forced *and* unnatural, *the Effect of breaking Nature's* Laws, *and rejecting her* Inſtructions: *For Men, as* Juſtin Martyr *told* Trypho *the* Jew, §* being corrupted by bad Education, evil Cuſtoms, and wicked Inſtitutions, had deſtroyed their natural Notions,

" Some

---

* Rom. i. 22. † James iii. 15, 16. ‖ Tit. iii. 3.

§* ὑπὸ φαύλης ἀνατροφης, καὶ ἐθῶν φαύλων, καὶ νόμων πονηρῶν διαφθαρέντες, τὰς φυσικὰς ἐννοίας ἀπώλεσαν.

" Some unhappy Accidents and Occaſions, " (ſaith *Archbiſhop* Tillotſon) may make Men " Enemies; but *naturally every Man is Friend to* " *another*, and that is the ſureſt and moſt unalter- " able Reaſon of Things, which is founded in " *Nature*, not that which ſprings from mutable " Accidents and Occaſions." *†

Wherefore I think, Men ought not to lay the Conſequences of their own Tranſgreſſion *at Nature's Door, nor to repreſent her as patronizing the* Diſcords *they raiſe.*

Contending Parties *fight, but all of them, profeſſing to do ſo for the Sake of* Peace, *agree in that which Nature dictates.*

The Doctrine *of* Chriſtianity, *proceeding from the ſame* Divine Wiſdom, *concurs in* eſtabliſhing *what the prime Laws of* Nature *taught, with a renewed Aſſurance of the Favour and Protection of the* ALMIGHTY. Live in Peace, *ſaith the Apoſtle*, and the GOD of Love and Peace ſhall be with you.*

The End *and* Deſign *of* CHRIST's Coming *was the* Reſtoration *of fallen Mankind into that State of Purity and Peace, wherein he was at firſt* created. Man *thus reſtored, and* renewed in the Spirit of his Mind, *is ſaid*, to put on the new Man, which after GOD is created in Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs.† *This*

*† Sermons in 8vo. Vol. 4. pag. 91. Edit. 1695.
* 2 Cor. xiii. 11. † Eph. iv. 23, 24.

This State of Reſtoration *to the Favour of* God, *is that excellent and deſirable Eſtate, which our bleſſed* Saviour, *the* Prince *of Peace, whoſe* Precepts *are adapted to the* Conqueſt *of all* Enmity, *brings the Obſervers of them into, and which* He *will beſtow upon the whole World, when they ſhall be univerſally obeyed.*

The Laws *of* Nature, *and the* Doctrine *of* Chriſtianity, *do alſo concurr in teaching Men* Humility; *inſtructing them* not to think of themſelves more highly than they ought to think, but to think ſoberly ‖; for if a Man think himſelf to be ſomething, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himſelf;* and vainly puft up by his fleſhly Mind, † *is apt to entertain a miſtaken Conceit of* Power *and* Wiſdom *of his own*, ſufficient to preſerve himſelf: *A Notion tending to withdraw his* natural Dependence *from* God, *his* Maker *and* only Preſerver, *and to fix his Confidence on* himſelf, *who* cannot keep alive his own Soul. **

It was a juſt † Obſervation *of Biſhop* Sherlock *concerning the* Iſraelites, That they were never ſo weak, as when they made themſelves ſtrong; never ſo certainly ruined, as when their Force was great enough to create in 'em a Confidence in themſelves.

" We

‖ Rom. xii. 3. * Gal. vi. 3. † Col. ii. 18.
** Pſal. xxii. 29.

† As cited by *John Doughty* M. A. in his Sermon preach'd at *Clerkenwell, Octob.* 9th. 1746.

"We cannot (*ſaith Archbiſhop* Tillotſon ‖*) "do a greater Prejudice to our Affairs when they "are in the moſt hopeful and likely Condition to "ſucceed and do well, than to ſhut God and "His Providence out of our Counſels and Conſi-"deration; when we paſs God by and take no "Notice of Him, but will rely upon our own "Wiſdom and Strength, we provoke Him to "leave us in the Hands of *our own Counſel*, and "to let us ſee what weak and fooliſh Creatures "we are: And a Man is never in greater Dan-"ger of Drowning, than when he claſps his "Arms cloſe about himſelf: Beſides, that God "loves to reſiſt the Self-confident and preſump-"tuous, and to *ſcatter the Proud in the Imagina-"tion of their Hearts.*"

Upon the Peruſal of the Diſcourſe *which occaſioned this* Enquiry, *it ſeemed to me not* clear *in thoſe* Two *important* Doctrines *of* Peace *and* Humility; *wherefore I thought it my reaſonable Duty, to publiſh ſuch Sentiments reſpecting them, as to me appear conſonant both to* Nature *and* Chriſtianity.

As my Subject *is* Love *and* Peace, *I make that my* Aim. My Thoughts *differ no more from that* Author's, *than* his Thoughts *do from* mine: *Wherefore that* mutual Difference *can give* no juſt Cauſe *of Offence to either of us.*

Such

‖* Sermons in 8vo. Vol. 4. pag. 212. Edit. 1695.

Such Readers, *as have perused* his *Discourse impartially, will probably do the like by* this, *which is all I request of them; who with Sincerity of Affection to* Him, Them, *and all* Mankind, *subscribe my self*

Philanthropus.

---

24 MA 59

AN

AN

Enquiry into the *Validity*

Of a late DISCOURSE, intituled,

The NATURE and DUTY

Of SELF-DEFENCE.

THE *Poſitions* which this Author lays down, as the *Baſis* of his Performance, are,

Pag. 1. That *Self-Defence* is *every Man's Right and Duty by Nature.*

Ibid. That *the Defence of our own Life and Property* is every Man's *Right and Duty* by the *Law of Nature.*

Theſe *Poſitions* he endeavours to fortifie againſt all *Oppoſition*, by aſſerting, that they are "univerſally *acknowledged*," and, "not only allowed by all other Chriſtian *Denominations*, but "even by the QUAKERS themſelves."

What he means by *Nature*, and the *Laws of Nature*, he explicates p. 2. by the "*Powers of*

" *Nature*," and " *That* Power which Nature " hath given us to preſerve ourſelves."

So that the Duty of *Self-Defence*, by him pleaded for, depends on the Truth of this *Poſition*, viz. " That *Nature has given us a Power to preſerve* " *ourſelves*."

This *Poſition* I cannot give my Aſſent to, becauſe,

1. Upon the ſtricteſt Scrutiny into my own Conſtitution, I, who am of the Human Species, cannot perceive myſelf to be inveſted with any ſuch Power.

2. This Author has not prov'd, and, I think, cannot prove, the Exiſtence of ſuch a Power in any Man, nor indeed, that any created Being has ſuch a Power.

3. The Notion of our being inveſted by Nature with a *Power* of *Self-Preſervation*, is apt to produce Pride and Self-Exaltation, to beget a falſe Confidence in ourſelves, and to remove our *Dependence* from God *the only Saviour* *, unto Man, *in whom there is no Help*. †

What is it, which, in this Author's Opinion, a Man has Power to preſerve himſelf from?

Is it from *Death*? Certainly not; ſeeing no Man can aſcertain his own Being here for a Moment

* *Iſai.* xliii. 11. † *Pſal.* cxlvi. 3.

ment of Time. *There is,* ſaith Solomon, *no Man that hath Power over the Spirit to retain the Spirit; neither hath he Power in the Day of Death*; and there is no Diſcharge in *that War.**

Is it from *Danger?* I conceive *not:* As is evident from the known Caſe of Perſons engag'd in Battle, where many of thoſe who are ſlain in Fight, were undoubtedly veſted with Strength, Courage, and every other Power of Nature, equal, if not ſuperior, to many of thoſe, who in the ſame common Danger are preſerved. It ſeems to me irrational, in them who are preſerved, to aſcribe their † Preſervation to thoſe Powers, which

* *Eccleſ.* viii. 8.

† *I ſhall here tranſcribe from the* Gentleman's Magazine *for* May 1746, *p.* 235. *a Paſſage expreſſive of the* Duke *of* Cumberland's *own Senſe of the preſerving Power and Providence of God:* " His Highneſs, *ſays that* " *Author*, when the Battle was over, retired for Re- " freſhment, to a Place near the Field. Soon after, " he took a ſerious Walk by himſelf, among the Mul- " titude of Slain. He was followed by ſome of his " Attendants, who obſerved him in deep Meditation. " He laid his Hand upon his Breaſt, and with Eyes " lifted up to Heaven, was heard to ſay, *Lord! what* " *am I! that I ſhould be ſpared, when ſo many brave* " *Men lie dead upon the Spot.* This Expreſſion of *deep* " *Humility* towards God, and Compaſſion towards " Man, is indeed worthy the greateſt Man alive." *To this let me add the ſame Author's Deſcription of* Humility. " This Quality, *ſays he*, is moſt excellent, when it pro- " ceeds from the Fear and Love of God, for he that, " ſenſible of his own Weakneſs, walks in a conſtant " Depend-

the Slain were equally poſſeſt of, and in the full Poſſeſſion and Exerciſe of which they were deſtroyed, and which conſequently were not the Powers of Self-Preſervation.

Is it from *Diſeaſes?* Or from *Caſualties?* I preſume no Man will affirm, that he has Power to keep himſelf from any of theſe. Wherefore I apprehend, that our Author's Aſſertion, that *Nature has given us a Power to preſerve ourſelves*, is not eaſily to be ſupported.

This Aſſertion has ſo manifeſt a Tendency "to "exclude God's Providence, either out of the "World, or out of the Argument," that our Author guards againſt that Objection, by telling us, p. 3. "That he has no ſuch Deſign." If that be true, 'tis a Reflection on his Prudence, to have uſed the moſt probable Means of attaining an End he does not aim at.

He acknowledges, p. 3. that "thoſe who ab-"ſolutely exclude Providence, teach the moſt "melancholy and uncomfortable Doctrine that "can be advanced:" But he ſhould have conſidered, that thoſe who *partially* exclude Providence, teach a Doctrine, carrying with it ſomewhat of the like dark and diſmal Aſpect: Hear his next Words, "*If it was not below Deity at* "*firſt*

"Dependence on God for every Bleſſing, is ſure of his "powerful Aſſiſtance, and of being exalted above e-"very Evil in this World, and in that which is to "come."

" *firſt to create, it can be no Diſhonour to interpoſe* " *as he ſees meet afterwards.*" Theſe Words plainly import a *partial Excluſion* of Providence, by repreſenting the Interpoſition of the Deity to be only occaſional, *as he ſees meet.* How far ſuch a *partial Excluſion* of Providence is conſiſtent with the Belief of the *Omnipreſence*, and *Omniſcience* of the Supreme Being, who created all Things, and * *upholdeth all Things by the Word of his Power: Who is* † *before all Things, and by whom all Things conſiſt:* I forbear to determine at preſent, but am of Opinion that it deſerves this Writer's moſt ſerious Conſideration.

Experience aſſures us, that perverſe Men, by an unnatural and unreaſonable Application of the Power which Nature has given them, for the Exerciſe of mutual Love and Benevolence, have often compaſſed the Deſtruction of themſelves, and one of another: But their *Help* and *Preſervation* is of God only: The Power of the Creator, is the ſole Preſerver of the Creatures which he hath made. *Thou, even thou, art Lord alone, thou haſt made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens, with all their Hoſt, the Earth, and all Things that are therein; and thou preſerveſt them all* ‖. As Man is not *Self-Exiſtent*, it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe him, *Self-Subſiſtent:* He is created a *dependent* Being, and his natural and rational *Dependence* is on the Power which created him for *Preſervation:* In this depending State Man ſtood ſecure, while

* *Heb.* i. 3. † *Col.* i. 17. ‖ *Nehem.* ix. 6.

while he abode in that primitive Innocence and Purity wherein he was created: In which State God ſaw him to be * *very good*, and gave him Dominion over the reſt of his Creation. O happy Eſtate of Nature in the Beginning. When Man's Submiſſion to the Will of his Maker was attended with the Submiſſion of all other Creatures unto him: When clothed with *Innocence*, as with a *Garment*, the Power of God *protected* him from the Fear of Evil, and kept him in perfect Peace. In this moſt happy and deſirable Eſtate was Man at firſt created: *This*, ſaith SOLOMON, *have I found, that God hath made Man upright; but they have ſought out many Inventions* †. Alas! *Sin entred*, and thence proceeded Infidelity, and Diſtruſt of that *Protection*, which the Conſcience of his own Guilt told Man he had forfeited. Men, having thus forſaken God their *Maker*, and loſt their natural Dependence on him their *Preſerver*, had not Power to preſerve themſelves, but ran into all Manner of Wickedneſs, until the *Imagination of the Thoughts of their Hearts being only evil continually, all Fleſh had corrupted his Way, and filled the Earth with Violence* ‖, until they had provoked the Wrath of the Almighty, by a general Deluge, to waſh the Earth from their Impurity.

Thus fell a Generation of Men, poſſeſt of the greateſt Strength and Power by Nature, many of them *Giants in the Earth, mighty Men, which were*

* *Gen.* i. 31. † *Eccleſi.* vii. 29. ‖ *Gen.* vi. 5, 12, 13.

were of Old, Men of Renown. Gen. vi. 4. Yet unable to preſerve themſelvesfrom the Deſtruction they deſerved: But, having departed from their natural Allegiance to, and Dependence on, the *preſerving* Power of God, and truſting in their own *Power* and *Might*, they were ſuddenly deſtroyed, and that without Remedy.

Noah, the *only righteous* Man of that Generation, truſted in God, and was preſerved.

And indeed, this *Dependence* on the Power of God alone for *Preſervation*, was the *Criterion*, or diſtinguiſhing Mark of the Righteous in ſucceeding Ages.

Moſes excites the feeble *Iſraelites*, deſpairing for fear of the mighty Hoſt of *Pharaoh*, to this *Dependence*, ſaying, *Stand ſtill, and ſee the Salvation of the Lord**.

Joſhua knew his *Security* to be in this *Dependence:* To which he was encouraged by the Promiſe of God, ſaying, *Be ſtrong, and of a good Courage; be not afraid, neither be thou diſmayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee, whitherſoever thou goeſt* †.

Gideon, to convince him of the Security of this *Dependence* on God *alone*, was directed to reduce his Army of 32,000, to only 300; leſt peradventure

* *Exod.* xiv. 13. † *Joſh.* i. 9.

adventure *Iſrael* might vaunt themſelves againſt *God*, ſaying, *Mine own Hand hath ſaved me* ‖*.

David, the valiant and victorious King of *Iſrael*, aſcribes all his Preſervations and Deliverances, to the Arm and Power of God only. *Truly*, ſaith he, *my Soul waiteth upon God, from him cometh my Salvation. He only is my Rock and my Salvation, he is my Defence* *. In this Aſſurance and holy Confidence, he prayeth, ſaying, *Deliver me from mine Enemies, defend me from thoſe that riſe up againſt me* †. And praiſeth the Lord, ſaying, *O God, I will render Praiſes unto thee, for thou haſt delivered my Soul from Death* †*.

Thus do the *Preſerved* of God *ever acknowledge his Might*, and rely on that alone.

The Notion of Man's being veſted with a Power of Self-Defence, and Self-Preſervation, did much prevail among the *Nations, who regarded not the Works of the Lord, nor the Operation of his Hands*** : But if we take a View of the dreadful *Cataſtrophe*, and miſerable *Exit*, of the boldeſt and ſtouteſt of the Pretenders to ſuch a Power, we ſhall ſee them made exemplary Inſtances of the Vanity of their Pretenſions.

Pharaoh King of *Egypt*, exalting himſelf, and oppoſing his *own Will* to the Command of God, ſaying, *Who is the Lord, that I ſhould obey his Voice*

‖* *Judges* vii. 2. * *Pſal.* lxii. 1, 2. † *Pſal.* lix. 1.
†* *Pſal.* lvi. 12, 13. ** *Pſal.* xxviii. 5.

Voice to let Iſrael go; * periſhed with all his Hoſt in the *Red Sea*.

Goliah, glorying in his *Natural* Strength and Stature, approaches *David* with the utmoſt Diſdain: *Come to me, and I will give thy Fleſh to the Fowls of the Air, and to the Beaſts of the Field*; † yet he fell by a *Stone* from the Sling of the Stripling whom he had deſpiſed. The Reaſon is obvious: This Youth truſted in the *Power of God*, the Giant *in his own*.

Sennacherib King of *Aſſyria*, boaſting of his Might, and enumerating the Nations whom his Fathers had deſtroyed, was ſuddenly ſurprized with the Loſs of 185,000 of his Army, in which he truſted; and returning home with Shame, was there ſlain by a Conſpiracy of his own Sons. ‖

Nebuchadnezzar King of *Babylon*, ſtrutting in his Palace, and elevated with the Conceit of his Greatneſs, utters theſe Expreſſions, *Is not this great* Babylon *that I have built for the Houſe of the Kingdom, by the Might of my Power; and for the Honour of my Majeſty?* ⸸ While he was thus ſpeaking, the immediate Rebuke of an higher Power, checkt his Inſolence; deprived him at once of his Underſtanding and his Kingdom, until he was better inſtructed; and from his own Experience was conſtrained to acknowledge *all*

* *Exod.* v. 2. † 1 *Sam.* xvii. 44. ‖ 2 *Kings* xix. 37.
⸸ *Dan.* iv. 30.

Power and *Dominion* to be of *God alone*; and that *all the Inhabitants of the Earth are reputed as nothing. Now*, ſaith he, I Nebuchadnezzar, *praiſe and extol the King of Heaven, all whoſe Works are Truth, and his Ways Judgment, and thoſe that walk in Pride he is able to abaſe.* *

Theſe Inſtances clearly demonſtrate, that Men in the full Poſſeſſion of the *greateſt human Power*, and of the *greateſt natural Strength*, have not a Power to *preſerve themſelves:* And that nothing is more pernicious to Man, than a preſumptuous aſſuming to himſelf a Power he hath not; *for if a Man think himſelf to be ſomething, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himſelf*;† and by falſe Notions of *imaginary Power* may be precipitately hurried on to his own Perdition.

That Man's *Preſervation* conſiſts in his Dependence on the Power of God only, is verified by the Words of the *Pſalmiſt*, ſaying, *There is no King ſaved by the Multitude of an Hoſt: A mighty Man is not delivered by much Strength. An Horſe is a vain Thing for Safety, neither ſhall he deliver any by his great Strength. Behold, the Eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him: Upon them that hope in his Mercy: To deliver their Soul from Death.*‖

Wherefore, *Ceaſe ye from Man, whoſe Breath is in his Noſtrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?* ✝

In

---

* *Dan.* iv. 37. † *Gal.* vi. 3. ‖ *Pſal.* xxxiii. 16, 17, 18, 19. ✝ *Iſai.* ii. 22.

In ſhort, the whole Drift and Current of Scripture Doctrine, is directly oppoſite to this Author's *Aſſertion* of a Power of *Self-Defence* and *Self-Preſervation* in Man by Nature.

So that the *Power* of *Self-Defence* and *Self-Preſervation*, which he ſuppoſes, appears to be meerly imaginary, and to have no Exiſtence but in the miſtaken Pride, and Self-Exaltation of Men's Minds: And conſequently the *Duty and Right* of *Self-Defence*, which he pleads for, has no real *Foundation*.

Inſtead then of the falſe and groundleſs Doctrine of *Self-Defence*; I ſhall take Leave to ſubſtitute that which is true and ſubſtantial, and will bear the Teſt: I mean, the Doctrine of *Dependence* on the *Power of God alone* for Preſervation. A Doctrine perfectly agreeable, both to the Laws of Nature, and the Precepts of Chriſtianity: For as this *Dependence* is "every Man's Right and Duty "by *Nature*; ſo the Goſpel of *Jeſus Chriſt*, the "great Bleſſing of all Nations, deſigned to im-"prove and perfect our Natures," doth eſtabliſh this our natural Privilege, by *Precepts* which enjoin the Practice of this Duty, in the higheſt Degree; and place the only Happineſs of Man in an entire Reſignation to the Will of God, and the only Security of the Creature, in depending on the Power of his Creator for Preſervation.

The eſtabliſhing *univerſal Love and Peace on Earth*, was the Deſign and Purpoſe of the *Chriſt-*

ian Religion, which was uſher'd in by a *Multitude of the heavenly Hoſt, praiſing God and ſaying, Glory to God in the higheſt, and on Earth Peace, Good Will towards Men.** To the Attainment of this bleſſed Eſtate, the *Precepts* of Chriſt are directed; they breathe nothing but pure *Love* and *Peace*, *Faith in God*, Patience *to endure all* manner of *Evil*, and a ſteady Reſolution of Mind never to do any: They enjoin a generous and rational Contempt of this World, and its Uncertainties; teach us to commit the keeping of our Souls to God, while here, and open a Proſpect of a perpetual State of Bliſs and Immortality hereafter,

To the Promotion of this bleſſed State of *Peace on Earth*, the Inſtitution of *Civil Government* doth alſo manifeſtly contribute; by aſſigning Puniſhment to the Diſturbers of the *Tranquillity* of others: So that Nature, Chriſtianity, and Magiſtracy, all concur in this *one Point*, viz. in one and the ſame bleſſed and deſirable Purpoſe of eſtabliſhing *Peace* on *Earth*. The Apoſtle *Paul* enforces his Injunction of *making Prayer and Supplication for Kings, and for all that are in Authority*, with this cogent Reaſon, *That we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life, in all Godlineſs and Honeſty*. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

This *Author* ſeems to lay too little Weight on the *Power* and *Providence* of God, which the *Goſpel* directs Men to, when he advances this Sup-

* *Luke*. ii. 13, 14.

Suppoſition, " If, ſays he, the Goſpel has laid " open the latter, (*viz.* the Perſons and Properties " of Men) to the Inſults, Ravages, and Depreda- " tions of ambitious and evil minded Perſons, " Government itſelf having no Object, whereon " to be exerciſed, muſt of Courſe be annulled " and deſtroyed."

Thus he miſrepreſents the *Goſpel*, as patronizing the *Diſorders* it moſt expreſly forbids; and as contradicting the End and Deſign of Government, which it expreſly eſtabliſhes.

What I have ſaid, is I hope ſufficient to ſhew, that *Wars* and *Fighting*, are neither conſonant to the *Laws of Nature*, nor to the *Doctrine of Chriſtianity*; that they are no other than the Conſequences of Sin and Infidelity, the Extirpation of which is aimed at by the joint Concurrence of Nature, Chriſtianity, and the Civil Magiſtrate; and that neither of theſe are inconſiſtent with the other of them.

We are next to conſider this Author's Examination " of thoſe Scripture Authorities, on which " (he ſays) the *Quaker*'s Scruple againſt Fighting " is founded."

He begins with what he calls " an Old Teſta- " ment Prophecy" *viz.* " *They ſhall beat their* " *Swords into Plow-ſhares, and their Spears into* " *Pruning Hooks, Nation ſhall not lift up Sword* " *againſt Nation, neither ſhall they learn War* " *any*

" *any more.**" He denies not the Truth of this Prophecy, nor its Relation to the *Goſpel* Times; but attempts to puzzle its Meaning by a Diſtinction of *Offenſive* and *Defenſive* War: A nice Diſtinction, which the Text itſelf gives no Ground for, and the Limits of which he would find ſome difficulty to aſſign; or to demonſtrate what Defence is in a Sword, without uſing it offenſively.

" There are, (ſays he, p. 4.) many Perſons of " meek and peaceable Spirits, who are, (without " forſaking the Doctrine of Self-Defence) in the " very State the Prophecy has Reſpect to, who " would not on any Account injure their Neigh- " bour to draw the Sword *offenſively.*" In this, he plainly admits the Prophecy to exclude *offenſive* War, which is all we aſk: Becauſe, if the Time be come, when *no one Nation ſhall lift up the Sword* againſt another *offenſively*, the Occaſion of drawing it defenſively will be taken away: and the *Cauſe* being removed, the *Effect* muſt ceaſe.

He adds, " The Prophecy infers no Change of " Principle in the beſt, but an entire Reformati- " on of Mind and Manners, amongſt the worſt " Sort of Men; from whom Fighting and Op- " preſſion have always proceeded." Seeing then, that the very End and Deſign of Chriſtianity, is to produce ſuch an entire Reformation of Mind and Manners among the worſt *Sort of Men*, from whoſe *Wickedneſs Fighting* and Oppreſſion proceed; it

* *Micah* iv. 3.

it neceſſarily follows, that ſuch an entire Reformation removes the Cauſe of War, and introduces that univerſal Peace, which a due Obedience to the Precepts of Chriſt would bleſs the Nations with. As many as lead their Lives conformable to the Doctrine of the Goſpel, have already (ſo far as reſpects themſelves) attained this happy and deſirable Eſtate, and in theſe the Prophecy infers no *Change of Principle:* An Argument brought from the preſent "evil and corrupt State of "Things," can be of no Force with thoſe who know that in the Purſuit of their *Chriſtian Duty*, they muſt row againſt that Tide; and that the Practice of the *worſt Sort of Men*, can be no juſtifiable *Precedent* for the *beſt Sort of Men* to follow. In ſuch a Caſe, the Practice of another Duty which the Chriſtian Religion moſt ſtrictly enjoins, is neceſſary, *viz.* that of *Self-Denial*, and patiently ſuſtaining temporal Inconveniencies, in expectation of an eternal *Reward*, prepar'd for thoſe who perſevere in well doing to the End. But this *Duty* our Author paſſes by without Notice, not imprudently, conſidering its direct Oppoſition to his Purpoſe.

Our Author undertakes (p. 5.) to conſider the New Teſtament Doctrine of this Matter, and cites the Precept of *Chriſt*, *Mat.* v. 38, 39, &c. *Ye have heard that it hath been ſaid, an Eye for an Eye, and a Tooth for a Tooth: But I ſay unto you, that ye reſiſt not Evil, but whoſoever ſhall ſmite thee on thy right Cheek, turn to him the other alſo; and if any Man will ſue thee at the Law, and take away*

away thy Coat, let him have thy Cloak alſo; and whoſoever ſhall compel thee to go a Mile, go with him twain; give to him that aſketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not away. " He tells us, p. 6, that this whole Paſſage muſt " be underſtood *literally*, or explained *figurative-* " *ly*, in ſuch Manner as the Nature of the Sub- " ject ſeems evidently to require." He goes on, p. 6, 7, 8, enumerating ſeveral *ſuppoſed Abſurdities* of the *literal Acceptation* of this Paſſage: In which, I think, he abuſes the moſt excellent Precepts, by attempting to charge upon them ſuch Conſequences, as only ariſe from the Unwillingneſs of Men to put them in practice. To me, the whole Paſſage, in its *literal Acceptation* appears moſt *beautiful*, as tending directly to introduce the moſt perfect State of *Happineſs*, the Nature of Man is capable of attaining in this Life. An univerſal Obedience to theſe Precepts, in their * literal Acceptation, would be the greateſt of

---

* *By* literal Acceptation, *I intend, the plain and obvious Senſe which the Words convey to the common Underſtanding of Men. Which Senſe, I apprehend, ought to be admitted in all* moral *Precepts of* Chriſtianity; *otherwiſe Men will be left in inextricable Difficulties reſpecting the Regulation of their* Conduct. *Nor, is it probable, that our Saviour,* Mat. vii. 24. *would have referr'd to thoſe* Sayings *of his, as the Rule of a wiſe Man's Obedience, in any other Senſe than that of their uſual Acceptation.*

And as 'tis frequent in the New-Teſtament *Writings, to expreſs the ſame Precept for Subſtance, in* different Words, *that is to be regarded as the* literal Senſe, *which thoſe ſeveral Forms of Expreſſion concur in conveying.*

of Bleſſings to Mankind, and eſtabliſh them in the Fruition of that Peace and Serenity wherein their *Felicity* conſiſts, and which the Goſpel of Chriſt would bleſs them with the Enjoyment of.

Let us conſider the Precepts ſeverally, *viz.*

1. *Reſiſt not Evil, but whoſoever ſhall ſmite thee on the Right Cheek, turn to him the other alſo.*

2. *If any Man will ſue thee at the Law, and take away thy Coat, let him have thy Cloak alſo.*

3. *Whoſoever ſhall compell thee to go a Mile, go with him twain.*

4. *Give to him that aſketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away.*

The *firſt* of theſe Precepts *prohibits* Wars: The Words, *Reſiſt not Evil*, which the Apoſtle explicates by, *Not rendring Evil for Evil*, not only forbid the *Injuring another*, but the *Avenging* one's Self. The following Words, *Whoſoever ſhall ſmite thee on the one Cheek, turn to him the other alſo*, lay the Ax to the Root of the Tree; they eradicate *Contention*, by the Force of Love, and pluck up the only plauſible Pretence of waging War, *viz.* that of *Self-Defence*, or *Self-Preſervation*. War, conſidered as meerly offenſive, is ſo generally abhorrent to the *Nature* and *Reaſon* of Man, that even the *worſt of Men*, in Words uſually diſclaim it, and cover their ambitious

Purpoſes with a *ſpecious Pretence* of Injury received. This Pretence is effectually taken away by Chriſt's Precept, which enjoyns, a quiet and peaceable enduring of *real Injuries*, *Patience* under the higheſt *Provocations*, and an unwearied Exerciſe of that *Chriſtian Magnanimity*, which can bear Inſults and Revilings without returning any. This *Patience* is the *Heroiſm* of *Chriſtianity*, the Effect of Faith and Truſt in God, and a viſible Demonſtration of that *Dependence* on his Power alone for Preſervation, which is our reaſonable Duty: 'Tis an Evidence of that *perfect Love* of God, which caſteth out the *Fear* of Man: 'Tis the Armour of *Innocence* againſt the Darts of *Fury*. *A ſoft Anſwer*, ſaith *Solomon*, *turneth away Wrath*. † The *patient* receiving of an Injury, carries with it a ſilent, but ſevere, Reproof to him who offer'd it; it ſets home upon his Conſcience the Evil of his Doings, by the convincing Energy of a better Example: *If thine Enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirſt, give him Drink; ſo ſhalt thou heap Coals of Fire on his Head:* * This is the only *Vengeance* the Doctrine of Chriſtianity admits of, *viz. Overcoming Evil with Good. Love* and *Peace*, being eſſentially and originally *Good*, have a kind of natural Dominion over *Hatred* and *Diſcord*, whoſe Origin is *Evil*. This the Inſtance in the Text, tends to illuſtrate: For if *a Man ſmite me on the Face*, and I bear it with a Spirit of Meekneſs, my *Patience* naturally checks his *Paſſion*; if

† *Prov.* xv. 1. * *Rom.* xii. 20.

if he repeats the Injury, it muſt be with Reluctance; till a *continued Patience*, confirming a Senſe of my *Innocence* in the Conſcience of the Aggreſſor, effectually ties up his Hands from farther Abuſe. But, if *he ſmites me*, and I return the Blow, he has the ſame Pretence for his *ſecond Stroke*, as I had for my *firſt*, and thus the Injury becomes mutual, one provocation excites another, Acts of Hoſtility and Violence become reciprocal, and the *Neceſſity* of *Self-Defence* is pleaded on both Sides: Thus War is fomented, and Strife continued, for want of Obedience to Chriſt's *Precept*, which would have put a Stop to its Progreſs in the Beginning. Such is the Excellency of this *Precept*, in its literal Acceptation, that it really eſtabliſhes all who mutually obſerve it, in that State of *perfect Peace* which the Deſign of the Goſpel is to introduce; and tends to promote the general Happineſs of Mankind, in Proportion to the Number of thoſe, who embrace the Doctrine it contains.

The *ſecond* of theſe Precepts, *viz. If any Man will ſue thee at the Law, and take away thy Coat, give him thy Cloak alſo*, appears to me, in its literal Acceptation, to recommend ſuch a peaceable and *Chriſtian* Diſpoſition of Mind, as rather to ſubmit to Wrong, or, as the Apoſtle expreſſes it, *ſuffer our ſelves to be defrauded*,* in earthly and temporal Concerns, than to be engaged in doubtful *Conteſts* at *Law*, which tend to diſturb

 that

* 1 *Cor.* vi. 7.

that Peace and Tranquillity of Mind, wherein the Happineſs of a true *Chriſtian* doth principally conſiſt. As then the Obſervation of this Precept hath a manifeſt Tendency to preſerve that *Peace* and *Tranquillity* of Mind, I ſee no Inconvenience in accepting it literally: And that the *Quakers* do ſo accept it, I think apparent by the *eſtabliſhed Rules* of their Society, by which the *Suing one another at Law is forbidden.* For as they regard this *Precept*, as binding upon all true *Chriſtians*, in regulating their mutual Converſe one with another; ſo they endeavour, in this Point, to live *among themſelves*, in the exemplary Practice of that *mutual Love*, and Obedience to *Chriſt*'s Precept, which if *univerſally* obſerved, would eſtabliſh univerſal *Righteouſneſs*, and Peace among Mankind, and totally put an End to all *Strife*, *Contentions*, and Law-Suits.

And, as the *principal Aim* of a *true Chriſtian* is, to enjoy an *undiſturbed Peace* and *Serenity* of Mind; I apprehend, that this Precept of *Chriſt*, is adapted to take away that, which hath an evident Tendency, to diſturb that *Peace*, and interrupt that *Serenity*.

The *third* of the foregoing Precepts of *Chriſt*, viz. *Whoſoever ſhall compel thee to go a Mile, go with him twain*, recommends, by an obvious and familiar Inſtance, the Excellency of a loving and ſocial Temper, a *Readineſs of Mind* to excel in Acts of Benignity and Condeſcenſion, and voluntarily to exceed the Expectation of others in that Reſpect;

Reſpect; ſhewing, that it behoves a *Chriſtian* Man to demonſtrate, by the moſt free and unconſtrained *Benevolence*, that *true Religion*, is an Improvement of *good Nature*, and renders its Obſervers exemplary in the Exerciſe of every Office of mutual Complacence and Humanity.

The *fourth* and laſt of theſe Precepts, is, *Give to him that aſketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away.* The Practice which our Saviour here recommends, is but a neceſſary Conſequence of that Love to God, and our *Neighbour*, which he thus expreſſes in another Place; *viz. Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, and with all thy Soul, and with all thy Strength, and with all thy Mind; and thy Neighbour as thy Self.** From this general Precept, of *loving God*, doth proceed, that of *loving our Neighbour*. And the Demonſtration of both conſiſts in Acts of Charity, and Liberality: *Whoſo hath this World's Good, and ſeeth his Brother have need, and ſhutteth up his Bowels of Compaſſion from him, how dwelleth the Love of God in him?* ‖ And again, *He that loveth not his Brother whom he hath ſeen, how can he love God whom he hath not ſeen?* † From a ſincere and ardent Love of God, that *mutual Love* one towards another, which the Spirit of *Chriſtianity* inculcates, doth as naturally flow, as a Stream from its Fountain; and where that *mutual Love* is, *mutual Acts of Charity*, as Occaſion requires, cannot be wanting. And ſuch

* *Luke* x. 27. ‖ 1 *John* iii. 17. † 1 *John* iv. 20.

ſuch are the *Acts* which the *Text* enjoins. So that the literal Meaning, and moſt obvious Senſe of this Text, ſeems to me to convey no other Doctrine than what is perfectly conſiſtent with the Goſpel of Chriſt.

Thus have I endeavoured to ſhew, that the "Nature of the Subject," which is that of *mutual Love* among *Chriſtians*, "ſeems evidently "to require, that "the whole Paſſage," containing the Precepts of Chriſt above recited, ought "to be underſtood literally." If herein my Sentiment differs, from that of "many Perſons of "the brighteſt Penetration," who (as our Author pag. 6, ſays) "take one Part literally, and greatly "qualify the other in their Interpretations," 'tis becauſe I have not attained to that ſuperlative Degree of *Penetration*; nor can I diſcern any *Part of the Paſſage* which in its literal Senſe is not perfectly conſiſtent with, and tending to promote that *mutual Love* which ought to preſide among *Chriſtians*; and which thoſe who are really ſuch, are required to exhibit themſelves to the World as lively Inſtances of, by the moſt exemplary *Patience* and *Innocence* of Converſation.

But, ſays our Author, "Is my Perſon by this "Doctrine expoſed to all Inſults and Abuſes? "Muſt I quit my own Ability to defend myſelf, "in Obedience to this Precept and Command; "am I in ſo doing altogether as ſafe under the "Care and Providence of God, as though I adhered to the *Law* and *Dictates* of Nature." To this

this I freely anſwer, I know of no *Safety* but under the *Care* and *Providence* of God: I know of no *Law*, or *Dictates* of *Nature*, which direct Men to ſeek Preſervation in any thing elſe but the *Care* and *Providence* of God: I know of no *Ability* a Man hath to defend himſelf, abſtract from the *Care* and *Providence* of God: I think he hath not a Moment of *Exiſtence*, but what depends on the immediate *Care* and *Providence* of God. And that every *Conceit* of his own *Abilities*, abſtract from that Care and Providence, proceeds from the Arrogance and Preſumption of his Heart, and is utterly inexcuſable and indefenſible. Wherefore I diſmiſs theſe *Queries* till their Author ſhall have prov'd the *Hypotheſis* upon which they are founded; and which, till then, I take to be *falſe*.

I concur with this Author in what he ſays, pag. 7, that "the Authority is the *ſame* in *both* "*Caſes*, of *Fighting*, *and going to Law*;" but then I underſtand the *Precepts* of Chriſt in both Caſes *literally*. And in ſo underſtanding them, I adhere to the very Purpoſe and Deſign of the Goſpel of Chriſt, *viz.* the Introduction of that univerſal Peace and Righteouſneſs, wherein Wars and Contention will be totally excluded. As many as thro' Obedience to the Doctrine of Chriſt have already attained to this State, ought to abide and continue therein, notwithſtanding the *Inſults* and *Abuſes* of wicked and unreaſonable Men. They ought not to be moved from their *Stedfaſtneſs* by the Contradiction of *Sinners*: A-

gainſt

gainſt which, the only Remedy the Goſpel preſcribes, is an *invincible Patience: If*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *when ye do well and ſuffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.*† And this Remedy will at length effectually conquer all Oppoſition: *For ſo is the Will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to Silence the Ignorance of fooliſh Men.** *That he that is of the contrary Part may be aſhamed, having no evil thing to ſay of you.*‖ This is a *Chriſtian*'s Triumph over "Men of "wicked and baſe Principles," not by fighting them at their own Weapons, and *ſubduing Evil by a ſuperior Force of Evil*; but by that Soveraignty and Dominion of Virtue over Vice, which *Nature* itſelf hath eſtabliſhed in every rational Being; and which the Precepts of *Chriſtianity* moſt effectually reinforce.

Againſt the literal Senſe of the Precept, *Give to him that aſketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away.* Our Author ſtates this Objection, "*There are*, ſays he, *many ſubſtan-*"*tial Men among the* Quakers, who were they to "conform literally to the Injunction of giving "and lending, would ſoon be impoveriſh'd and "made needy themſelves, by the conſtant De-"mands of worthleſs and indigent Perſons." But if he will conſider this Precept in its true Light, as an Injunction of *mutual Duty*, to be not only *ſtrictly* and *literally*, but alſo *reciprocally*, conformed to among *Chriſtians* in *general*; he may ſee the

† 1 *Pet.* ii. 20. * 1 *Pet.* ii. 15. ‖ *Tit.* ii. 8.

the Impoverishment and Need he suggests immediately provided for by the voluntary Contributions of others under the like Obligation of a reciprocal Performance of the same Offices; by means whereof, instead of *Poverty and Want*, will arise a secure and perpetual Fund of *never-failing Charity*.

His Objection, pag. 8. "That the Text does "not as *Christians*, oblige them both to *give* "and *lend*, without having Regard to the *Me-*"*rits* or *Wants* of the *Asker* or *Borrower*, or "even to our own Circumstances," may be allowed, without receding from the literal Sense; because the Words themselves of *asking* and *borrowing* do plainly imply the *Want* of the *Asker* and *Borrower*; and the Words, *give* and *lend*, necessarily import the *Ability* of the *Giver* and *Lender*. Take away *Want* on the one Hand, and *Ability* on the other, and the Precepts becomes both useless and impracticable. But where one *wants* what the other *hath*, the Injunction abides in Force; and by *giving* and *lending*, must be understood, not "only a merciful and "benevolent Disposition of Soul, ready and wil-"ling to assist and comfort," but also an actual *giving* and *lending* really to *assist* and *comfort* the *Poor* and *Needy*. So also by not going to *Law*, is meant, that *Christians* should be so *harmless*, *meek*, *quiet*, and *peaceable*, as rather patiently to *endure wrong*, and *suffer themselves to be defrauded*, than to disquiet themselves with *Law-Suits*, and in the Pursuit of Trifles, lose

 that

that *Peace* of *Mind* which is the true Treaſure of a *Chriſtian*; a Legacy of Chriſt's own giving; *Peace I leave with you, my Peace I give unto you*: The leaſt Portion of this is too valuable to be riſqued for any temporal Advantages.

Our Author is pleaſed, pag. 9, 10, 11, to deſcant upon ſome other Precepts of our Saviour, which he thus expreſſes, *viz. That we ſhould take no Thought for the Morrow, for our Lives, or for what we ſhall eat and Drink; that God* who cloaths *the Lillies, and feeds the Sparrows, will abundantly provide for his Children, who are much better than many Sparrows*: "This, *ſays he*, "is poſitively ſpoken, and if *literally taken*, ex-"cludes all human Care and Induſtry; that we "ſhould be as *totally* dependent on the *Provi-"dence* of God, as are the *Sparrows*, nay, as are "the *inanimate Lillies* themſelves." This kind of arguing, which repreſents the Creatures of *leaſt Underſtanding*, as *moſt dependent* on the Providence of God, appears to me unreaſonable: Becauſe, I apprehend, that the *ſuperior Reaſon* of Man, doth not leſſen, but increaſe his *Dependence* on God his Creator: It enables him to diſcern the *Frailty* and *Weakneſs* of his *Conſtitution*, and to magnify and adore the *Power* of him who is both his *Maker* and *Preſerver*. It ſhews him the Uncertainty of his *Exiſtence* here, and that *he knows not what ſhall be on the Morrow*. 'Tis therefore reaſonable that his *Care* and *Induſtry* ſhould, as his *Knowledge* is, be limited to the Preſent Time, and that he ſhould not be anxious for a Futurity

of

of Things, in their own Nature to him, altogether uncertain. His preſent Care and Induſtry are to have no Part or Share in his *Dependence*; that muſt be *entirely* on the *Providence* of God who made him *careful* and *Induſtrious*, and without whoſe *Bleſſing*, all his *Care* and *Induſtry* can't ſupport his Life a ſingle Moment. So that the *Text*, which forbids *taking Thought for the Morrow*, tho' taken *literally*, doth not exclude human *Care and Induſtry*, but limits it within its proper *Sphere* of *Dependence* on the *Providence* of God, which ever includes both the *Means* and the *End* of whatſoever conduceth to the Support of the Creatures which he hath made.

I apprehend, that this Author doth not expreſs a becoming Reverence for the *Precept* of Chriſt, when he repreſents it as *literally* oppoſite to the *Duty of Man*; which he ſeems to me to do, when he ſays, pag. 10, "All wiſe and good "Men take ſome Thought for the Morrow, 'tis "their Duty ſo to do." But the *expreſs* Words of our Saviour, are, *Take no Thought for too Morrow*. Thus he aſſerts, that 'tis the *Duty* of all *good* and *wiſe* Men, to do what the *Precept* of our Saviour expreſly and literally prohibits. This amounts to a flat *Contradiction*, ſuch as I think, *Chriſtian* Prudence cannot admit; and that the Author has reaſon to ſuſpect, that a *miſtaken Notion* of Man's Duty has led him into it: Peradventure he has not throughly conſidered this Point; and that *good* and *wiſe* Men having no aſſured *Futurity* in this World, can exerciſe a pre-

ſent honeſt Induſtry in earthly Matters, without ſetting up themſelves, or leſſening that *Dependence* on God, even for their temporary Subſiſtence, which is their reaſonable Duty: Theſe knowing the Fruits of their Labour, to be the Gift of God, not of themſelves, find an abſolute Neceſſity, notwithſtanding their *daily Diligence*, to be continually praying to God in *Sincerity* and *Truth*, *Give us this Day our Daily-bread*: The *Limitation* of this Petition to *the preſent Day's* Supply, exactly correſponds with the *Prohibition* of *taking Thought for the Morrow*; eſtabliſhes the Neceſſity of a continual Dependence on the Providence of God; and makes the Prayer of a Chriſtian, as to outward Things, commenſurate with his Care and Duty concerning them, by equally reſtricting both within the Verge of the preſent Day.

Thus have I propoſed the Reaſons inducing me to believe, that all the fore-mentioned Precepts of Chriſt, are to be underſtood according to their *plain* and *literal* Senſe: And that in Caſes of poſitive Precept, no pretended *Phraſeology* of *Scripture* ought to be admitted in Contradiction to the plain and obvious Senſe; becauſe the Admiſſion of that Pretence, has a manifeſt Tendency to ſubvert the Doctrine of the Goſpel of Chriſt, and render his *Precepts* uſeleſs and inſignificant.

The next Text this Author undertakes to examine is, "Our Saviour's Anſwer to *Pilate* on his "Examination, * *My Kingdom is not of this*

* *John* xviii. 36.

" *World, elſe would my Servants fight, that I ſhould* " *not be delivered to the* Jews." " Now, *ſays he*, " in what manner this proves their Point, that " all Fighting is forbid by Chriſtianity, I pro- " feſs *I do not ſee.*" Yet himſelf acknowledges, that the Nature of Chriſt's Kingdom is " to eſta- " bliſh a *Spiritual Dominion* over Sin in the Soul." Now thoſe in whom ſuch a *Spiritual Dominion* over Sin is eſtabliſhed, are freed from the Occaſion of Wars and Strife, whoſe Original is Sin. This himſelf ſo far conſents to, as to ſay, that " Fight- " ing and Oppreſſion have always proceeded from " the worſt Sort of Men," *viz.* thoſe in whom Chriſt's *Spiritual Dominion over Sin in the Soul is not eſtabliſhed.* The plain Conſequence of all which is, that ſo far as Chriſt's Spiritual Dominion over Sin is eſtabliſhed, ſo far the Occaſion of Wars and Fighting is taken away. And as the Intent of Chriſt's coming into the World, was the Eſtabliſh- ment of that Spiritual Dominion over Sin univer- ſally among Mankind, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that the Effect of that univerſal Eſtabliſhment of Chriſt's Spiritual Dominion, would be an entire Eradication of the *Cauſe of War*, and a total Ceſſa- tion of *Fighting and Oppreſſion.* This is that per- fect State of the Goſpel of Peace, foretold by the Prophets, which a Subjection to the Spirit of Chriſt hath already brought ſome into, and which they firmly believe, ſhall more and more ſpread among the Nations, until the *Kingdoms of this World are become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Chriſt, and he ſhall reign for ever and ever.* Rev. xi. 15.

Theſe peaceable Chriſtians are the beſt Members and Subjects of a worldly Kingdom; their Principle of *Peace* is a ſubſtantial Bond of Fidelity and Allegiance to the Government they live under: The Eſtabliſhment of Chriſt's ſpiritual Dominion over Sin in the Soul, which reſtrains them from fighting, enlarges their Hearts to the faithful Performance of every Office of Love and Benevolence, pertaining to the Happineſs of *Human Society*; of which Happineſs, *Love* and *Peace* are principal Ingredients: Theſe *Social Virtues* are the Cardinal Doctrines of Chriſtianity, without which *Human Society* cannot be: For tho' this Author aſſerts, p. 13, that "Religion is *one* "*Thing*, and *Human Society*, with its Privileges, "quite another," yet have they a neceſſary *Connexion*, and the *Latter* cannot ſubſiſt without that *Love* and *Peace* which the Former enjoins: They are both "immediately in *God's Hand*," who hath ordained the one to be beneficial to the other: And I think, this Author makes an unwarrantable Diſtinction, when he ſays, "One is "more immediately in God's Hand, the other in "great Meaſure *left* to the *Wiſdom* and OEconomy "of Man." Thus he inſinuates an *Abſence* of God's *Providence*, and a withdrawing of him, *who upholdeth all Things*,* but the Exiſtence of *Human Society* proves that Inſinuation as certainly falſe, as it is true that *in him we live and move, and have our Being*.† This Diſtinction he pretends St. *Paul was abundantly ſenſible of*: But how does

* *Heb.* i. 3 † *Acts* xvii. 28.

does he prove that? "*The Civil Magiſtrate*, ſays "he, St. *Paul* aſſures us, is the Miniſter of God, "ſet up by his Authority, to be a Terror to Evil "Doers, and a Praiſe to them that do well; that "he is God's Miniſter, attending continually on "this very Thing, and that we ought to ſubmit "and be obedient, not only for Fear but for Con-"ſcience Sake:" And will needs have it, p. 15, "that Civil Power, as taught by St. *Paul*, is di-"rectly oppoſite to Chriſt's Doctrine of *not re-"ſiſting Evil*: Take, ſays he, the Precept in St. "*Matthew*, and this Doctrine of St. *Paul*, both "in a literal Senſe, and they amount to an abſo-"lute Contradiction, and any Man alive may be "challenged to ſhew the contrary." This is both *pert* and *poſitive*; and yet perhaps may be a *Miſtake*: For, as we have already ſhewn, the Precept in *Matthew* forbids *rendring Evil for Evil*, but the *Juſtice* of Government in puniſhing Evil Doers is *good*; ſo that the Patience of a *private* Chriſtian in bearing Injuries, and the Juſtice of Government in puniſhing Evil Doers, are ſo far from being *contradictory*, that they really concur in one and the ſame good *Purpoſe*, of overcoming *Evil* with *Good*; the one of them by the ſmooth and alluring Motives of *Love* and good Example, the other by the reſtraining Power of good Laws. For, as the literal Meaning of the Precept in *Matthew*, prohibits only rendring *Evil* for *Evil*, the Adminiſtation of Juſtice, in a legal Way, being *good*, may reſiſt *Evil* without any Breach of that

* *Rom.* xiii. 9.

that Precept: But when he ſays, that this "is to "reſiſt Evil in the fulleſt and compleateſt Man-"ner, by the Conſent of all Sorts of Chriſtians," he is miſtaken; becauſe ſome Sort of Chriſtians do think, that to convince and reclaim a Sinner from the Evil of his Ways, by the convincing Force of Love and good Example, may poſſibly on ſome Occaſions be as full and compleat a Manner of *reſiſting Evil*, as any *Puniſhment* the Law can inflict.

He tells us, p. 15, "That in many Inſtances, "Government itſelf *cannot* ſubſiſt without Fight-"ing:" And attempts, p. 16, 17, 18, to ſtate ſuch *Inſtances*, and particularly the Caſe of the late *wicked Rebellion*, in which he aſcribes to the Power of Man, that Preſervation which ought to be attributed to the *Providence of God*. This Power of Man, is with him, "eſſential to the "very Being and Preſervation of Civil Govern-"ment:" Without this, *ſays he*, "Our Laws "muſt at leaſt have been deſtroyed; our Liber-"ties taken away; our Perſons enſlaved; and "every Thing put into Diſorder and Confuſion." But in all this, I think, he reaſoneth not aright, in making that *eſſential*, which at moſt is but *circumſtantial*: As *good Government* is ordained of God, his *Power* and *Providence* alone are *eſſential* to its Preſervation: And to affirm, that "a good "*Government*" under the Protection of his Power and Providence, *cannot* ſubſiſt without fighting; appears to me very little, if at all, ſhort of denying the *All-ſufficiency* of that Power and Providence.

dence. Wherefore, my *Sentiments* on this Subject being *eſſentially* different from his, I think it expedient to expreſs them, in Relation to the Inſtance he brings of the *late Preſervation* of our *preſent Government*; which I eſteem a *good Government*, and eminently ſo, when compar'd with the *evil Government* of its Invaders. This *good Government*, I conſider, as under the Protection of the Power and Providence of God; which alone is ſufficient for its Preſervation: And am clearly of Opinion, that ſuch a good Government might have been perfectly ſecure, in *caſting all their Care upon him who careth for them*, without having *Recourſe* to *outward Arms*, had they been ſupported with a Sufficiency of *Chriſtian Faith* to have made the Experiment. Their *Reſort to Arms* was not the Effect of *Chriſtian Faith*, but of *Human Frailty*; a Means, not *appointed of God*, but invented by Man, to ſupply the Weakneſs of his Faith, and the Imperfection of his *Truſt* and *Confidence* in God. It has been the Method of Divine Providence to manifeſt his Power, by an immediate Deliverance of thoſe who truſt in him, in times of the *greateſt Diſtreſs*. This Author well obſerves, p. 18, that, "If a good Magiſtra-"cy is ever to be ſupported, 'tis certainly *worthy* "of it in ſuch a trying Seaſon as this." And certainly in ſuch a Seaſon, let that good Magiſtracy *cry unto the Lord in their Trouble*; and he will *bring them out of their Diſtreſſes*. But this Author, in *Bar* of Man's expecting his "whole Help or "Aſſiſtance from the Hand of God," inſiſts upon his "having already Power in himſelf." Which

pretended Power in himſelf, he calls his *firſt Help*, and the Aſſiſtance of God a *ſecond Help*. This Preference of the *Power of Man* to the Aſſiſtance of God, I think is both anti-ſcriptural and irrational; but as I have herein before ſhewn, that Man is not *inveſted with the Power* of *preſerving himſelf*, let it ſuffice, that what he calls his *firſt Help*, is no Help at all; and what he calls a *ſecond Help*, is indeed the only *Help* he has. *Put not*, ſaith the Pſalmiſt, *your Truſt in Princes, nor in the Son of Man, in whom there is no Help.** And again, *My Help cometh from the Lord, which made Heaven and Earth.*† This Help is the only *Preſervation* of Man; for *unleſs the Lord keep the City, the Watchman waketh but in vain.*‖ To this *Help of God*, in the firſt Place, the late Deliverance of this Nation and its Government, is to be aſcribed, and not to their *Uſe* of *Arms*; for altho' God in his gracious Condeſcenſion may be pleaſed, to permit Men engaged in a good Cauſe, to defeat their Enemies with ſuch Weapons as their *little Faith* may prompt them to make uſe of; yet we may not reſtrict the Power of divine Deliverances to ſuch outward Means, as the worſt of Men place the greateſt *Dependence* in; and in that Dependence juſtly meet with deſerved Deſtruction. But they that place their intire *Dependence* on the *Power* and *Providence* of *God*, are certainly, in the Reaſon and Nature of Things, much better intitled to his immediate Care and *Protection*, than thoſe who put their Truſt in any thing elſe.

Such

* *Pſal.* cxlvi. 3. † *Pſal.* cxxi. 2. ‖ *Pſal.* cxxvii. 1.

Such an *entire Dependence* on Providence would render the Uſe of Arms unneceſſary: And I am really of Opinion, that the Excellency of the preſent Government of this Nation, and the Juſtice of the Cauſe it is engag'd in, do ſo far intitle them to the Divine Favour, that had they, in full Aſſurance of Faith, *ſtood ſtill*, they might have *ſeen the Salvation of God*, without Fighting. Nevertheleſs, with reſpect to ſuch Men of Virtue, Power, and Courage, as, having not yet attained to the Perfection of Chriſtian Faith in this Point, are exerting themſelves in the Cauſe of Juſtice and Liberty, I detract not from their due Applauſe and Commendation; nor do I in the leaſt deny, that God, in Regard to the Equity of their Cauſe, may, and doth give them Succeſs, and Victory, to the deſerved Chaſtiſement of the wicked Promoters of Tyranny and arbitrary Power. But, I do not think, that ſuch favourable Providence of God towards them, doth neceſſarily imply his Approbation of ſuch Meaſures, as the Deficiency of their Faith induced them to have recourſe to.

The next Paſſage of Scripture cited by our Author is this of the "Apoſtle *James*, viz. *From* "*whence come Wars and Fightings amongſt you*, "*come they not hence even of your Luſts?* * This "Text, as himſelf acknowledges, reſpects the "Source or Beginning of Wars, which take their "Riſe in Avarice and Ambition amongſt the

* *James* iv. 1.

" worſt Sort of Men." Seeing then the very End and Purpoſe of Chriſt's Coming, was *to take away the Sins of the World*, * of which *Avarice* and *Ambition* are none of the leaſt, it muſt have been his Purpoſe, by taking away the *Source and Beginning* of Wars totally to prevent them.

The next Thing this Author remarks, p. 19, is, that " a certain great, and indeed judicious " *Apologiſt* for the *Quakers*, is pleaſed to obſerve, " that when the Soldiery came to inquire of *John* " *the Baptiſt* what they ſhould do, part of his " Anſwer was, *do Violence to no Man*; † which " this great Writer ſeems to think equivalent " with an *abſolute Prohibition of War*, it being " hard to perceive, how War ſhould ſubſiſt with- " out Violence." This Obſervation of the Apologiſt is reaſonably founded on the Difficulty of perceiving *how War ſhould ſubſiſt without Violence*. The only rational Way of confuting it, were to ſolve that Difficulty, which yet this Author does not ſo much as attempt. But inſtead of that endeavours, by ſtarting a *Variety* of *Senſes* in the *Prohibition* itſelf, to avoid the *true one*: " May not, ſays he, " this Violence be underſtood, 1ſt, of *Offenſive* " *War*." I think it may not: Becauſe, I apprehend, that is a Diſtinction which Soldiers are not admitted to make. " Or, 2dly, *ſays he*, that " when an Enemy is by the Fortune of War in- " tirely in our Power, to ſave or deſtroy, Soldiers " ſhould then be humane and ſparing of Men's " Lives."

* *John* i. 29. † *Luke* iii. 14.

" Lives." But I conceive this Senſe will not hold, becauſe the Bounds of it are exceeding narrow, and bear no juſt Proportion to the Extent of ſo general a Prohibition. " Or, ſays he, 3dly, It " may be underſtood of thoſe *private Plunders*, " *Pillages* and *Ravages*, which common Soldiers " are too liable to be found in." Which Senſe I can admit, becauſe it hinders not, but that it may alſo be underſtood of *publick Plunders*, *Pillages*, and *Ravages*, unleſs he can ſhew wherein *theſe* are leſs pernicious to Mankind than the *other*; for till that be ſhewn, the Reaſon of the Prohibition evidently extends to both; and the following Advice, *To be content with their Wages*, may be a diſtinct *Caution*, not to be *mutinous* or troubleſome about their Pay, and may have no Relation either to the Lawfulneſs or Unlawfulneſs of their Work.

He acknowledges p. 20, that *War is a very terrible and undeſirable State*; but queries, " would " it not be more *terrible* to remain *quiet* and un- " oppoſing under the horrid Murders, Ravages, " and Devaſtations of *execrable abandon'd Vil-* " *lains?*" I anſwer, that in ſuch a *State*, the Condition of the *Patient* is much to be prefer'd before that of the *Agent*; and *ſuffering Innocence* is far more deſirable, and leſs terrible, than *inſulting Wickedneſs*; the former is perfectly *Chriſtian*, and the latter *Diabolical:* The former exceeding *good* and *virtuous*, the latter abominably *evil* and *vicious*. Wherefore, I think, his Diſcourſe, p. 20, has an *Inconſiſtence* in its *Terms*; his mentioning the *moſt juſtifiable Grounds*, of that which is *unjuſti-*

fiable;

fiable; and the *Mercy* and *Juſtice* of continuing *Cruelty* and *Abuſe*; and of keeping *War* alive for the *Good of the whole*, which good can never be accompliſhed but by its *Extinction*; ſeems to me not altogether ſo clear and intelligible as the Expreſſions of a Man, whoſe Aim is to be underſtood, ought to be.

What our Author next takes notice of, is a Book intitled, *A Defence of Quakeriſm*, by *Joſeph Beſſe*, in anſwer to a *Preſervative againſt Quakeriſm*, written by *Patrick Smith*, Vicar of *Great Paxton* in *Huntingtonſhire*.

The Paſſages in this Book, which he cites and remarks upon, from his 21ſt to the 29th Page, were written in Anſwer to the *Vicar*'s Attempt of reſtricting *Chriſt*'s Precepts, *Matt.* v. 38, *&c.* within the Limits of certain Terms of his own Invention, ſuch as *all tolerable Injuries*, and *inconſiderable Debts and Treſpaſſes*; upon which the Writer of the *Defence of Quakeriſm*, obſerves, "Thus does he, *(the Vicar)* play upon our Sa-"viour's Precept with Words of uncertain Sig-"nification, ſuch as, *all tolerable Injuries*: Who "can ſettle the Meaning of theſe Terms? What "Injuries are they, which a violent and furious "Man will admit to be tolerable, *&c.*

To this our preſent Author, in the *Vicar*'s Stead, returns this Anſwer, "The *violent* and *furious Man* "is not fit to judge aright of the Extent of this "Precept, but a *meek* and *reaſonable Man*, may pretty

" pretty nearly judge and diſtinguiſh betwixt thoſe " Injuries which are *fit*, and thoſe which are not " fit to be endured."

To this I reply: As a *violent* and *furious Man* will think *no Injuries tolerable*, ſo a *meek* and *reaſonable Man*, endued with *Chriſtian Patience*, will think *no Injuries intolerable*, becauſe in the Exerciſe of that Patience he finds Strength to bear them.

The Writer of the *Defence of Quakeriſm* proceeds, " Let our Adverſary inform us, what De- " gree of *Intereſt* that is, which will warrant " a Man's diſpenſing with the Precept of Chriſt."

To which this Author anſwers, " No Intereſt " will warrant this: But here the Queſtion is ei- " ther *evaded* or *begged*; the *Precept itſelf* is " readily admitted, but the Extent of it, whether " it be *literal* or *figurative*, is the very Point in " Queſtion, and the Thing to be debated.

To this I reply: That I have herein before argued that Point, and endeavour'd to ſettle the Thing in Debate, by ſhewing that the Precept of Chriſt is to be underſtood according to the literal Acceptation: The *Queſtion* therefore being now pertinent, I take his Anſwer to it for concluſive, *viz.* " That no Intereſt will warrant a Man's " diſpenſing with the Precept of Chriſt," and conſequently, that in point of Obedience to Chriſt's poſitive Precept, the Diſtinction made by the

Vicar

Vicar of *tolerable* and *intolerable* Injuries, and of *conſiderable* and *inconſiderable Intereſt*, can have no Place; becauſe thoſe *Injuries* which haſty Men call *intolerable*, a Chriſtian Patience, in bearing them for Chriſt's Sake, makes *light* and *eaſy*: And that Intereſt in temporal Things, which *Men of this World* may call *conſiderable*, may, when put in Competition with the rich Reward and Benefits of Obedience to Chriſt's Command, appear to *true Chriſtians*, *inconſiderable* and worthleſs. Wherefore I eſteem theſe *Terms* of *Diſtinction*, as empty and frivolous *Amuſements*, invented to divert the obvious Senſe of a *plain Chriſtian Precept*.

The Writer of the *Defence of Quakeriſm*, in order to ſhew the Ambiguity of the *Vicar*'s Terms, obſerves, "That may be an inconſider-"able Intereſt to one Man, which to another "may be his Main."

In his Anſwer to this, pag. 22, our Author plainly acknowledges, "that we cannot eſtabliſh "a *Criterion* that will ſuit every Body." Which, I think, amounts to a Conceſſion that the *Vicar*'s Terms are of uncertain Signification, and have no fixed Meaning; which is the Point inſiſted on.

He again, pag. 23, makes the following *Citation* from the *Defence of Quakeriſm*, viz. "But "this manner of Diſcourſe is attended with ano-"ther Abſurdity; it ſuppoſes Chriſt to enjoin "the leſſer Degrees of *Chriſtian* Virtue, but not

"the

" the greater: For Inſtance, Patience is a *Chriſtian* " Virtue: Our Opponent admits, that Chriſt's " Precept obliges us to ſuffer patiently *all tole-* " *rable Injuries*; but that *he doth not reſtrain his* " *Followers from going to Law to defend ſome* " *conſiderable Intereſt.* This is contrary to Rea- " ſon and the Nature of Chriſt's *unlimited Pre-* " *cept*, which that Man *beſt obſerves*, who practiſes " in the *higheſt* Degree the *Virtue* recommended. " If 'tis a *Virtue* to bear a *little Affront*, 'tis cer- " tainly a *larger Degree* of that *Virtue* to bear " a *Greater*, &c.

The Anſwer of our Author to this, is as follows; " Here our Saviour's Precept is at once " affirmed to be *unlimited*, and that going to Law " to defend ſome conſiderable Intereſt, is an ex- " preſs Violation of it; though the *Quakers* make " no Scruple to ſhelter themſelves and Properties " under the Law. How many Applications to " *Parliament* have they *paid*, and retained *Coun-* " *cil* to plead for; has not this been done by " them as a Body? And ſurely this is incon- " ſiſtent with this Gentleman's Account of " Chriſt's unlimited Precept."

To which my Reply is; That tho' I undertake not the Defence of Men's Practices, but of *Chriſt*'s *Precepts*; nor do I think that his Commands are to be meaſur'd by their Conformity; yet I apprehend in this Inſtance, there is no Contrariety between them; becauſe an Application to *Parliament* may be conſiſtent with a Diſpoſition entirely

peaceable: It has nothing in it of that *avenging* and *irritating Nature*, which mutual Conteſts at Law are ordinarily attended with. For which Reaſon I think this Inſtance of the *Quakers* applying to Parliament, is not pertinently alledged, nor is at all inconſiſtent with the Account which the Author of the *Defence of Quakeriſm* hath given of Chriſt's *unlimited Precept*, *i. e.* a *Precept* wherein is no *Limitation* either expreſs'd or neceſſarily implied.

Our Author continues his Anſwer, and ſays, "Nor does the Limitation I have ſo much pleaded for in *the Interpretation of this Precept*, at all ſuppoſe *Chriſt to enjoin the leſſer*, rather than *the greater Degrees of Chriſtian Virtue.*" To which I reply, That as the Writer of the *Defence of Quakeriſm*, had nothing to do with this *Author* or his *Pleadings*, 'tis ſufficient for that Writer, that the *Vicar*'s Limitation by him pleaded for, did infer that Suppoſition.

Our Author, pag. 24, aſſerts, that "Every Virtue carried beyond a certain Pitch, loſes its Nature, and becomes Vice." But this I think to be a Miſtake, and that the *Nature* of *Virtue* has ſuch a Contrariety to that of *Vice*, as is utterly incapable of any ſuch *Tranſmutation* or *Tranſubſtantiation*, as that the *One* of them can ever become the *other* of them. I have always thought, that the *greateſt Degree* of *Virtue*, was at the fartheſt Diſtance from *Vice*: And that the *Frailty* and *Infirmity* of Man is ſuch, as that he need

need not apprehend any Danger of extending his *Practice* of Virtue to an *Exceſs*. Our Author's guarding againſt that is therefore unneceſſary; and 'tis unreaſonable, becauſe 'tis not the *Exceſs*, but the *Defect* of *Virtue*, which borders upon *Vice*. He tells us, pag. 24, that "All Virtues "have their Bounds;" but he errs in aſſigning the *proper Extent* of them, when he makes the *Virtues* of *giving* and *lending*, meerly ſubſervient to the *Conveniencies* of a *Man* and his *Family*; whereas our Saviour himſelf extends them to the utmoſt, not of Men's Conveniencies, but of their *Abilities*. *If*, ſays our Lord to a rich Man, *thou wilt be perfect, go and ſell that thou haſt, and give to the Poor, and thou ſhalt have Treaſure in Heaven; and come and follow me.** But this Advice not ſuiting his *Conveniency*, *he went away ſorrowful*, having too much of this World's Riches to be willing to part with 'em. This giving up his All, is a "*Criterion* that will "ſuit every Man;" becauſe it makes every Man's *Ability*, be it *more* or *leſs*, the Meaſure of his Charity: *For if there be firſt a willing Mind, it is accepted according to that a Man hath, and not according to that he hath not.* 1 *Cor.* viii. 12.

Our Author pag. 25, 26, ſeems unneceſſarily to be upon his Guard againſt an *Exceſs* of Patience: Tho' probably, ſome Men may think, there is no ſuch Thing. "A Man, *ſays he*, on the "*pacifick* Principle, may *ſtand ſtill*, and be mur-

* *Mat.* xix. 21.

" der'd by any Scoundrel or Villain." And if he does ſo, his *Quietneſs* renders the *Guilt* of ſuch a *Villain* the more inexcuſable, and his own *Innocence* the more conſpicuous. He adds, "There " is a *certain* or *proper Degree* of *Patience* and " *Forbearance* to be exerciſed, beyond which we " cannot go, without giving too great Licence " and Encouragement to the Abuſer." But I think, I have already demonſtrated, (pag. 18, 19. foregoing) that a *continued* Patience doth moſt effectually diſcourage and reſtrain the Abuſer from repeating an Injury. He proceeds thus, " *For-* " *bearance* is the firſt Good we ought in many " Caſes *to return for Evil*; but that carried to " a *certain Pitch*, another kind of *Good* ought to " be returned for *Evil.* Bodily Chaſtiſement, or " the Correction of the Law, is ſometimes the " greateſt Good that can be return'd for Evil: It " teaches the *Offender* to *know* and *do* better for " the future." But with this *rendring Good for Evil*, Chriſtian *Forbearance*, in its utmoſt Extent, does not appear to me, in any wiſe inconſiſtent; nor do I think, that ſuch Chaſtiſement as the Law hath appointed to *Offenders*, for the Reformation of themſelves and others, is any Breach of *Chriſtian Patience* and *Forbearance:* Becauſe I apprehend, that every private *Chriſtian* may exerciſe the *utmoſt* Patience and Forbearance in *ſuffering Injuries*, without interfering in any Degree with the *Authority* and *Power* of the Magiſtrate in puniſhing the Offender: So that the ſtricteſt Obligation of every Man's Obedience to Chriſt's unlimited Precept, has no Tendency to make the

Law

Law a *meer Noſe of Wax*; nor to prevent its Puniſhment of a *murdering Villain*. Wherefore, a *Chriſtian Patience* and *Forbearance*, may be continually practiſed, and carried on, without giving any "Kind of Criminal Indulgence to the Fol-" lies, the Vices, and Wickedneſs of Men."

Our Author again, pag. 26, cites from the *Preſervative* againſt *Quakeriſm*, (pag. 221) this Paſſage, "Let us intreat the *Vicar*, when he ſhall " reconſider this Paragraph concerning Forgive-" neſs, to bear alſo in Mind that Portion of the " Lord's Prayer, *Forgive us our Debts, as we for-" give our Debtors*, and he will eaſily obſerve, " what a lamentable Conſequence muſt attend " reſtricting the latter Part of that Expreſſion, to " *inconſiderable Debts and Treſpaſſes*."

In this Paſſage, the Writer of the *Preſervative*, ſhews, that the *Vicar*'s * reſtricting Man's Duty of

* "The Greatneſs of the Injuries which are done " to us, is the Reaſon (ſaith Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*) " commonly pleaded by us, why we cannot forgive " them. But whoever thou art, that makeſt this an " Argument why thou canſt not forgive thy Bro-" ther, lay thy Hand upon thy Heart, and bethink " thy ſelf, how many more and much greater Of-" fences thou haſt been guilty of againſt God: Look " up to that juſt and powerful Being that is above, " and conſider well, whether thou doſt not both " expect and ſtand in need of more Mercy and Fa-" vour from him, than thou canſt find in thy Heart " to ſhew to thy offending Brother. We have all " certainly

of Forgiveneſs to *inconſiderable Debts and Treſpaſſes* doth conſequently reſtrict Man's Right of petitioning God for the Forgiveneſs of *great* Offences: A Conſequence, which, tho' naturally deduceable from the *Vicar*'s Reſtriction, ſeems to me lamentable beyond Expreſſion: And, I think, this Author, in attempting to evade that Conſequence, has gone beyond his Depth; when in pag. 27, he aſſerts, that "It does not follow, that "forgiving all the Treſpaſſes committed againſt "us, infers the ſame Forgiveneſs from God for "our ſelves." In which Aſſertion he expreſly *contradicts* the Words of Chriſt himſelf, *Mat.* vi. 14, *If ye forgive Men their Treſpaſſes, your heavenly Father will alſo forgive you.* This gracious *Declaration* of the Divine Condeſcenſion to Men of merciful Diſpoſitions, he attempts to evade by this Conſtruction, *viz.* "If the Treſpaſſes "committed againſt us may be few, whilſt our "own Sins and Treſpaſſes againſt God and our "Neighbour may be many and enormous; "how then will paſſing by a *few*, intitle us "to an abſolute Remiſſion of our *many* and "grievous Offences? To think ſo, is wantoning "with

"certainly great Reaſon to expect, that as we uſe "one another, God will likewiſe deal with us. And "yet, after all this, how little is this Duty practis'd "among *Chriſtians?* And how hardly are the beſt of "us brought to love our Enemies, and to forgive "them? And this, notwithſtanding that all our "Hopes of Mercy and Forgiveneſs from God, do "depend upon it." *Sermons* in Octavo, Vol. 4. Edit. "1695, pag. 116.

" with the *Divine Mercy*, and ſetting too low a " Price on a Bleſſing of the moſt *invaluable* Na- " ture." In which, I think, he reaſoneth not aright: For the Words of Chriſt do not import the *ſetting of any Price* on the *Bleſſing* of God's *Forgiveneſs*; nor do they imply any *Title* or *Merit* on Man's Part: They are only a *free* and *gracious* Declaration of the Goodwill and Pleaſure of God, who delighteth in Mercy, to reward thoſe who are merciful. *Bleſſed*, ſays *Chriſt*, in his Sermon on the Mount, *are the Merciful, for they ſhall obtain Mercy*:* Not by way of Purchaſe, Price, or Commutation, but of *Reward* and *free Gift*: Not of *Debt*, but of *Grace*. Wherefore this Author's *Conſtruction* of " ſetting " a Price on the Divine Mercy," ſeems to me a Perverſion of the Text in order to palliate his own Contradiction of it. And, I think, that in diſcourſing upon the Words of our Saviour, the Uſe of ſuch an Expreſſion, as " *wantoning* with " the Divine Mercy" doth not beſpeak a *decent* and *Chriſtian Reverence*. And I do intreat him, when writing on ſuch ſerious Subjects, to beware of being *ludicrous*, and of permitting the Excurſions of his *wanton* Fancy to exceed the Bounds of *ſolid Judgment*. I think the imaginary Caſe he has workt up, pag. 28, in *Oppoſition* to the *Patience* and *Forbearance* we plead for, is an Excurſion of that Sort: It behoveth an *humble Chriſtian* to expect ſuch a Degree of Patience as may ſupport him under ſuch *wicked* and *provoking* Caſes as

* *Mat.* v. 7.

as he ſhall meet with in the *real Occurrences* of human Concerns, without extending his Views to *Fictitious* Ones; ſuch as this Author is oblig'd to invent, and from which *only* he is capable of deducing an Inference equally imaginary, *viz.* that "Patience would rather be a *Crime* than a "*Virtue.*" I concur with him, when in the Cloſe of a Paragraph, pag. 29, he ſays, "We "ought in the main, by conferring Benefits on "the Evil and the Good, to demonſtrate the "near Relation we bear to our Father that is in "Heaven." Tho', I think, thoſe Words, *in the main*, had been better left out, becauſe they ſeem to infer ſuch a Limitation as the Doctrine of the Scripture doth not any where expreſs.

Our Author, pag. 29, cites another Paragraph, from the *Preſervative* againſt *Quakeriſm*, *viz.* "Pag. 221. To our Opponents Query, Does "not Chriſt ſay, *His Kingdom is not of this* "*World, or elſe his Servants would fight for him*; "*and does it follow therefore, that his Servants are* "*not to fight?* We anſwer, that ſuch a Conclu-"ſion *does* plainly follow from the Premiſes; and "that his, (the *Vicar's*) ſaying, *But he plainly* "*ſuppoſes, that if his Kingdom had been a worldly* "*Kingdom, his Servants would, and might have* "*fought for him*, is a weak Evaſion, grounded "only on a mere Conceit of an Impoſſibility, "*viz.* Chriſt's *ſuppoſing the Reverſe of what him-*"*ſelf declares.*"

To

To this our preſent Author anſwers, " This " Point ſtands, I hope, pretty well accounted for " in Pages 12 and 13 of this Pamphlet." To which *I reply*; What is there accounted for, I hope, is pretty well anſwered in Pages 28, and 29, of this Inquiry. Nevertheleſs, ſince he is pleaſed to add ſomewhat farther on this Point, I ſhall conſider it: He adds, pag. 29, 30. " Our Sa- " viour, we allow, does not abſolutely make " ſuch a Suppoſition as the *Vicar* ſuggeſts, but, " 'tis nevertheleſs, an *eaſy* and *plain Conſequence* " of Chriſt's Words, and what we may rationally " and plainly infer from them; for as the Caſe " then ſtood, his Diſciples, or ſome of them, at " leaſt, *would* have fought for him; the Mean- " ing therefore of *would*, as it ſtands in the Text, " may be underſtood, *they reaſonably might.*" This Conſtruction, I think to be forced and unnatural; and that as the Text plainly oppoſes *Chriſt's Servants* to the *Men of this World*, ſo it as plainly ſets the Practice of the former in *Oppoſition* to that of the latter: And that the *peaceable State* of *his Servants*, is illuſtrated by the contrary *Cuſtom* of thoſe who *are not ſo*: And indeed, I cannot but think, that ſuch *peaceable State* of Chriſt's Diſciples, is *more reaſonable*, *more natural*, and *more Chriſtian*, than the contrary Habit of other Men. And conſequently, that the Word *would*, refers only to the *Cuſtom* of Men, and infers not the *Equity* or *Reaſonableneſs* of that *Cuſtom*.

He adds farther, pag. 30, that " Our Saviour " —in Reſpect to his Divinity, may alſo be ſtiled,

" *the King of Kings*, in which Senſe, all the " Kingdoms of the World are his; but in a *more* " *peculiar Senſe*, thoſe *Princes who are juſt, ruling* " *in the Fear of God*, may be deemed his *Vice-* " *gerents*." But to me it ſeems, that our Saviour, in reſpect to his *Divinity*, being *Omnipreſent*, his *Miniſters* are not properly to be termed *Vicegerents*; becauſe the Uſe of the Word *Vicegerency*, as it imports an *Abſence* of the Principal, is derogatory to the Omnipreſence of our Saviour, which is an *eſſential Attribute* of his Divinity.

Wherefore, " *good* and *wholſome Laws*, and the " Magiſtrate who adminiſters them aright" may be " greatly approved by *God* himſelf;" and ſuch Magiſtrates may be acknowledged to be *God's Miniſters*, without being deemed his *Vicegerents*. Such a Government, I have before ſhewn, is appointed by God, as a Means of *rooting out Strife and Contention*, and of eſtabliſhing *Love* and *Peace* among Men, which are *eſſential* to the *Well-being*, *Felicity*, and *effectual Stability* of ſuch a *Government*: This Eſtabliſhment of *Love* and *Peace* anſwers the *End* and *Inſtitution* of Government: And, as the *Excellency* of every *Inſtitution* conſiſts in accompliſhing the *End* for which it was ordained: So the Excellency of *Civil Government* conſiſts in eſtabliſhing *Love* and *Peace*, and in puniſhing the Breakers of *Love* and *Peace*, which in *their own Nature* are eſſential to the general Good and Happineſs of Mankind, and " for the Secu- " rity of all the Members of Society." So that the Magiſtrates Power of reſtraining the *Peace Break-*

er

er is the *Power* of *Love* and *Peace*, exerciſed for the Happineſs of human Society: But the *Power* of *War* is a Power of Devaſtation and Deſtruction, of a *contrary* and *oppoſite* Nature; and is exerciſed for the Purpoſes of mutual Deſtruction, and tends to the Subverſion of *Society* and *Government*. Wherefore the *Power of War* being conſidered as a Power of *Deſtruction*, and the *Power of the Magiſtrate*, as a *Power of Love and Peace*, there will appear no manner of *Inconſiſtency* in admitting, that the *Precept* of Chriſt, *Reſiſt not Evil*, or *render not Evil for Evil*, may *reaſonably* be underſtood, equally to prohibit *War*, and eſtabliſh Magiſtracy.

This Author's next Citation from the *Preſervative* is in pag. 31, 32, thus, "The next Thing "our Adverſary undertakes, is reconciling a *ma-* "*niſeſt Contradiction*. He tells us, that Fighting "and Killing Men, as is done in War, *is not* in- "conſiſtent with *Chriſt's Precept of loving Ene-* "*mies*, and then compares it with *Magiſtrates in-* "*flicting corporal Puniſhments and Death on Ma-* "*lefactors, Robbers and Murderers. But that is* "*far from being a parallel Caſe*, ſince *Malefactors* "and *Murderers* are puniſhed by Laws themſelves "deny not the Juſtice of; whereas the Caſe of "War is vaſtly different, wherein the Subjects "on both Sides, fighting (as upon our Adverſaries "Principles they ought to do) by the Command "of their Princes, are not admitted to be Judges "of the Equity of the Cauſe they are engaged

"in,

" in, and are therefore to be eſteemed equally *in-*
" *nocent.*"

In anſwer to this, our Author queries, pag. 32. Where is this " *Contradiction?* " To this I reply, that there appears to me a *manifeſt Contradiction*, between the Practice of *loving Enemies*, and the *promiſcuous Slaughter* of *Men* on both Sides *innocent*, which *War* is attended with. But, I think, the Puniſhment of *Malefactors* carries with it no ſuch *Contradiction*; but that *Juſtice* in ſuch a Caſe may be adminiſter'd without diſobeying any Precept of the Goſpel: And that this Author has not ſhewn any juſt parity betwixt ſuch legal Adminiſtration of *Juſtice*, and the Practice of *War*. I think alſo, that *nothing* which the *Writer* of the *Preſervative* has ſaid about *putting Malefactors to Death, for offending againſt Laws which they themſelves deny not the Juſtice of*, will bear ſo *malevolent* a Conſtruction as this Author has put upon it, *viz.* that of ſuppoſing *their Rebellion innocent*. And I think, that even the *Rebels* themſelves cannot *rationally* deny the *Juſtice* of their *Puniſhment* for their *Rebellion* againſt the *Government* by Law eſtabliſhed; ſince 'tis undeniable, that if they themſelves (which God forbid) were in Poſſeſſion of ſuch an Eſtabliſhment, they would think it both *juſt* and *neceſſary* to enact and execute Laws of the ſame Kind and Tendency, againſt thoſe who ſhould moleſt them. Wherefore, I apprehend, that if *Right Reaſon* did operate in them, it muſt neceſſarily involve theſe *Rebels* in the Sentence of *Self-Condemnation*, as being *guilty* of that ſame *Wickedneſs*, which themſelves,

ſelves, in the Perſons of other Men, would have judged worthy of the ſame Puniſhment.

Our Author admits, pag. 32, 33. *That Subjects fighting under different Princes, do ſo merely in Obedience to their Princes, and are very often innocent as to the Quarrel.* This he owns to be an "hard Caſe on ſuch Subjects." Nor doth he deny, that the *mutual Slaughter* of ſuch innocent Perſons does attend the *Practice of War.* But I think, that what he writes on that Head is not *clear*; and that altho' (to uſe a Metaphor of his own) "he pulls hard againſt the Wind and Tide," yet he has not demonſtrated, how the *mutual* ſhedding of innocent Blood, as in the Caſe of *mutual* War, can be *mutually* practiſed, without ſome Degree of *mutual* Guilt: He ſays indeed, pag. 34. That "a Nation ſtanding on the de-"fenſive, are not anſwerable for innocent Blood "ſhed after this Manner." But as in the Caſe of mutual War, both Parties generally pretend to ſuch a Standing; it may be *exceeding difficult* to determine that Point. It would certainly be a much ſafer Courſe to "rely on Providence, as the "*Quakers* have ever done," than to engage in *War*, at the Riſque of incurring any Share of ſuch Guilt: And the *Security* of ſuch *Dependence* on God's Providence is ſupported by a *valid Reaſon*, which may be well expreſs'd in the Words of this Author, pag. 34, *viz.* becauſe "an All-knowing "and impartial Judge, will not only ſcourge the "Pride and Avarice of Princes, but in his *own* "*due Time* have Regard to the Sufferings of the

"In-

" Innocent." This is an *excellent Maxim*, conſonant both to the *Juſtice* and *Mercy* of God, who only knows *his own due Time*, for abaſing the Proud, and relieving the Oppreſſed: 'Till that Time comes, *Chriſtianity* has made *Patience* the Duty of the *Innocent*, and ſupplies them with *Faith* to believe, that he will relieve them in his *own due Time*, who never *faileth* them that *put their Truſt in him*. 'Tis the *Impatience* of Men, and their Diſtruſt of God's Providence, which hurries them to anticipate *God's own due Time*, by precipitate *Meaſures* of their own deviſing, and from this Root *Wars* among Mankind do generally proceed.

The next Thing this Author attempts, p. 34, 35, is the anſwering of an Objection of *Robert Barclay*'s, which he thus repreſents, " What *R. B.* " obſerves about *Chriſtians living in different* " *Kingdoms at War together, and praying as well as* " *fighting for contradictory Things*, amounts to " very *little*." Now *R. B*'s Words are theſe, " By which forcing of the Conſcience, they " would have conſtrain'd our Brethren, living in " divers Kingdoms at War together, to have im- " plored our God for contrary and contradictory " Things, and conſequently impoſſible; for it is " impoſſible that two Parties fighting together, " ſhould both obtain the Victory." This *Robert Barclay* calls *Confuſion*. And this Author has not reconcil'd ſuch contradictory Prayers, either to *Reaſon* or *Religion*. He puts a Caſe, pag. 35, *viz.* " If a *Chriſtian* ſees the evil Deſires of his " Prince

" Prince to be his leading Motive to War, he " neither can nor will, as a true *Chriſtian*, pray " for his Succeſs." Which I think, amounts to a Conceſſion, that *ſuch a Prince* in that Caſe ought not to be *obey'd*; and conſequently, that his *Injunction* is unjuſt. And indeed, where two Princes at War enjoin Prayers for their *Succeſs* in *contrary Cauſes*, the Command of one of them muſt neceſſarily be ſo. Wherefore the *Confuſion R. B.* complains of in point of Prayer, this Author has by no means accounted for. And his acknowledging, that the *Spirit* of God " will never in- " ſpire two Minds to pray for contrary Things, " is a plain *Conceſſion* that ſuch *Confuſion* contra- " dicts the *Inſpiration* of that Spirit." And as he alſo acknowledges that " the *Will of God* is one." Such a contrariety of Prayer cannot be agreeable to his *Will*. Wherefore, I am of Opinion, that the Obſervation of *R. Barclay*, which this Author ſays " amounts to very little," is indeed *ſubſtantial*, and amounts to abundantly more than his *Anſwer* to it.

He produces yet another Citation from the *Preſervative*, reſpecting the Government of *Penſylvania* raiſing *Money* for the Service of the Government here; which he unfairly repreſents thus: " The Government there, are ſubject to the Go- " vernment here; and that the *Quakers* finding " *Money to pay Soldiers*, is very different from " *ſending* Soldiers themſelves." This he calls, an *inviſible Diſtinction*, and ſays, pag. 36. " I wiſh " I could perceive the Difference either in the

" Caſe

" Caſe of the *Land-Tax*, or paying Money into " the Government's Hands, for them to pay " Soldiers, or paying the Soldiery our ſelves:" This Diſtinction, which he calls *inviſible*, ſeems to me altogether *clear* and *evident*. The *Quaker* has a Regard to Chriſt's Precept, *Render unto* Cæſar *the Things that are* Cæſar's, as a poſitive Precept, which he is obliged both in Duty and Conſcience to obey: This Precept is *General*, and has no Exception annexed: Wherefore his Conformity thereto is alſo *General*, in paying readily all ſuch *Taxes* as are given by Law, for the Service of the Government; and in making ſuch Payment, he doth literally obſerve the Precept of Chriſt, and wholly diſcharge himſelf of the Duty required. But to what Uſes the Money ſo paid ſhall be applied, it is incumbent on the Conſcience of the *Government*, not of the *Quaker*, to direct: Such Application is *their* proper Province, and none of *his*: And as he never meaſures one Man's *Duty* by another Man's *Conſcience*, ſo he cannot expect that the Government in ſuch Application ſhould follow his *Judgment*, but their *own*. He is therefore as *ready to pay*, and in caſe of Neceſſity, as *free to give*, toward the Exigences and Support of Government as any other Subject: And having ſo done his own Duty, can quietly ſubmit, and leave to his *Superiors*, the Performance of *theirs*, according to their own Judgment: And thus keeping within his proper Sphere, his Obedience to Chriſt is perfectly reaſonable, as well in *Rendring to* Cæſar *the Things that are* Cæſar's, which Chriſt hath *commanded*, as in *refraining* from *Wars* and *Fighting*,

Fighting, which he believes Chriſt hath prohibited. Thus the *Diſtinction* appears to me very clear, and if this Author *can't* perceive it, I don't think that a valid Reaſon for his reproaching the *Quakers* with Blindneſs, who ſee farther than he does.

The pretended *Simile* he advances, (pag. 37) of "a *Factor* or *Steward*, very willingly paying a "Bill to his *Principal* himſelf, but *refuſing* it to "his Order," is quite foreign to the Purpoſe, and unapplicable to the *Quakers*, who are never known to *refuſe* Payment of the *Taxes* given to the *King*, the *Principal*, to the *Collectors* who are his *Order*. Nevertheleſs, as to *Militia* Money, *Church Rates*, *Tythes*, and *any other Demand* affecting their Conſciences, they are ſtill juſtifiable in refuſing to pay them; becauſe they are not given to *Cæſar*, and conſequently not included in Chriſt's Precept: Nor are their *Conſciences* diſcharged from being immediately concerned in the Application of them.

"Some, ſays this Author, pag. 37, may think "I ought to have made a formal Anſwer to every "Thing urged by *R. B.* on this Head, under the "Propoſition of *Salutations* and *Recreations*: "But I have declined that, and took another "Method (for one Reaſon among others) out of "*a ſincere Reſpect for the Memory of that great and* "*good Man*, the moſt *infirm* Part of whoſe *excel-*"*lent* Writings I was loth to ſet to public View."

This Paragraph imports, that he has no *mean Opinion* of his own *Abilities*, but would inſinuate to his Readers, as if he had declined a Conqueſt he could have made over *R. B.* on this Subject: This looks like proclaiming a *Triumph* before the *Victory:* For ſome who have read both of them, are of Opinion, that what he calls the moſt *infirm* Part of *R. B*'s Writings, is attended with a Force of Reaſoning far ſuperior to the *ſtrongeſt Part* of his; and that his *concealed Reaſons* for declining to anſwer that Writer, may probably be of more Force than that which he has *revealed.*

As to the Practice of the firſt or early Chriſtians reſpecting War and Fighting, I concur with him when he ſays, pag. 38, "The Queſtion is not ſo "much what they did, as what was their *Duty.*" However, I apprehend that the *Hiſtory* of the firſt *three Centuries* of Chriſtianity, would furniſh a Man with abundance more Inſtances againſt *Chriſtians* fighting than for it; even tho' we ſhould admit that of the *Thebean Legion*, cited by Dr. *Cave*, which yet others think to be *fabulous.** The Text

* "The Story at large, (ſays *Echard* in his *Ecl. Hiſt.* "Vol. 2, pag. 653) is attended with ſo many great "Difficulties as to *Hiſtory*, *Chronology*, and *Geography*, "and ſupported by ſuch weak Authorities, that ſeve-"ral learned Men have not only doubted the Particu-"lars, but have pronounced the whole a Fable."

The ſame Author gives an Account of the peaceable Behaviour of the more early *Chriſtians*, (*ibid*, pag. 533. "The Behaviour, (ſays he) of the Chriſtians toward "*Severus*

Text our Author cites, pag. 40. *One ſhall chace a Thouſand, and Two ſhall put Ten thouſand to flight*, aſcribes nothing to the *Military Temper* of the *one* or *two*; but attributes all to the Power of God, and the Safety of *depending* thereon, notwithſtanding the greateſt Inequality either in *Numbers*, *Natural Strength*, or *Military Preparations*.

I think I have ſufficiently ſhewn, that "the "underſtanding and conforming literally to thoſe "Scriptures we have been examining," is not attended with *Miſchiefs* and *Abſurdities*, as this Author pag. 42 would inſinuate: But that on the contrary, were they *literally* and *univerſally* put in practice, they would *univerſally* eſtabliſh that bleſſed and Evangelical State of perfect Peace and Righteouſneſs, which is the higheſt Happineſs Men are capable of being bleſſed with in this Life.

"*Severus* was a great Inducement to him to be very "favourable to them; for he, who took notice of "every Thing, could not but ſee, that in all his Wars "they never appeared againſt him, neither joining with "*Niger* † nor *Albinus*: The Concerns of another Life "were chiefly in their View, and they willingly left "this World to thoſe buſie Men, who were ready "to put every thing into Confuſion to obtain it."

† *Niger* at that Time was a formidable *Rival* to *Severus*, and had quietly poſſeſs'd himſelf of *Byzantium*, and the *Eaſt*, and *Albinus* declar'd for himſelf in *Britain*. So that the Paſſage cited includes the quiet Demeanour of Chriſtians in different Parts of the Empire.

What this Author obſerves (pag. 42) *viz.* that " If it be a Chriſtian Virtue to depend on Provi- " dence in *one* Caſe, it muſt be a greater to do it " in a *ſecond*, and ſo on, 'till we become in every " Caſe totally *dependent* and *inactive*, and refuſe " to do any or the leaſt Thing for our ſelves: " This would be the Conſequence of underſtand- " ing ſome Parts of Scripture literally," is, I think, of no great Weight, nor is the Inference he draws from it juſt, becauſe a *total Dependence* on Providence may be, and is, very conſiſtent with our own Activity and Endeavours, which we then moſt reaſonably exert, when we are moſt dependent on that which alone can make them ſucceſsful. This *entire Dependence* on God is the *Life* of human *Induſtry* and *Diligence*. 'Tis this which ſupports Men in the Performance of their Duty, both towards God and one another. This makes the *Sleep of a labouring Man ſweet*, by enabling him, when he has done his Duty, to *caſt all his Care upon God who careth for him*: So that Dependence on Providence is ſo far from rendring Men *inactive*, that 'tis the Support and Security of their *Activity*, the *Anchor* of their *Hope*, and the Encouragement of their Continuance in Well-doing. 'Tis that which makes *Induſtry* their *reaſonable Duty*, as commanded by him who is their *Feeder* and *Preſerver*, and from whoſe Bounty alone they receive their *daily Bread*. Thus all the lawful *Activity* and *Induſtry* of a Chriſtian is totally dependent on Providence: He both *works* and *prays* for his daily Subſiſtence. His outward Labour is ſubſervient to his inward *Dependence* on God:

God: While his *Hand* is exerciſed in the *former*, his *Heart* is wholly fixed on the *latter*: And the Experience of every *paſt* Days Proviſion both *whets* his *Induſtry*, and encreaſes his *Dependence*, for the preſent Days Supply. *To-morrow* he regards as *none* of *his*, and what perhaps he ſhall never ſee: And if he ſhould, he diſtruſts not the Providence of God for the future, of whoſe paternal Proviſion the many paſt Days of his Life have given him as many renewed and moſt convincing Proofs.

But altho' *Induſtry* and *Activity* be our acknowledged Duty in Things commanded by Chriſt, all whoſe Precepts tend to the *General Good* of *Mankind*; yet they are never to be exerciſed in doing what he hath prohibited: In ſuch a Caſe *Activity* is Diſobedience: Our *Induſtry* therefore muſt be limited within the Bounds of our known *Duty* and the *Good* of Society. But to extend our *Activity* to *fighting* and mutually *deſtroying one another*, is going beyond thoſe *Bounds*; and therefore Chriſt hath forbidden it.

His Extenſion of what he calls the *Quaker*'s Principle of not reſiſting Evil, to the "depriving "them of all *Family Authority*, if not OEcono-"my, and ſoon bringing every Thing into Diſ-"order and Confuſion," is carrying the Point too far; and ſeeing himſelf acknowledges, that they "indeed do not carry their Doctrine to this "Pitch," I think, he might have contented himſelf, without extending it farther than they do; and might have conſidered, that *Love* and *Peace*,

Peace, *Inſtruction*, and *Example* in well doing, are far more effectual to the eſtabliſhing of both *paternal* and *magiſterial Authority*, and *OEconomy*, than Blows and Stripes: Becauſe the former have a Tendency to reach and convince the *Reaſon* and *Underſtanding of Men*; whereas the *latter* are rather adapted to *brutal* and *irrational* Animals, who directed only by Corporal Senſation, fear nothing but what they feel; and are never properly applicable to Men, otherwiſe than in proportion to the Deficiency of their Judgment and Underſtanding.

He obſerves, pag. 43, that "*One Thing*, which "has perhaps determined ſome Perſons to think "more favourably of this Sentiment of the *Quakers*, than otherwiſe they would have done, is "thoſe *extraordinary Providences* which have attended to *ſuccour* and *protect* thoſe, who have "born this Teſtimony boldly and faithfully to "the World: But this, *ſays he*, I think amounts "to very little." On the other Hand, I think, that ſuch *extraordinary Providences ſuccouring* and *protecting* thoſe who uſed no outward Weapons to defend themſelves, but endured with Chriſtian Patience a great Fight of Afflictions, (ſome of them even to the Loſs of Life, others of Liberty, and Eſtate, and others to the Baniſhment of their Perſons) amount at leaſt to this, that they viſibly demonſtrate the Security of depending wholly on *the Providence* of God, as this People then did, patiently enduring the *Time* of *Tryal*, until it pleaſed God, in whoſe Hands the Times and Seaſons

Seaſons are, and who turneth the Hearts of Men according to his Pleaſure, to plead their Cauſe, and to open a Way for their Deliverance, and for the free Exerciſe of their Conſciences toward him: A Bleſſing, for the Continuance of which, they are always ready to expreſs their Gratitude to our preſent Soveraign King *George* and his Government, and to pray for the Peace and Proſperity of him and his Family, whom God in Love to this Nation has raiſed up, and placed on the Throne, to do Judgment and Juſtice.

The Obſervation therefore of the Providence which hath attended this People is a reaſonable Motive to a Judgment of their *Innocence* and *Integrity*, but can be no Proof of their being *miſtaken*: Which is an Epithet I would not chuſe to annex to the Word *Chriſtian* as this Author has done.

Thus have I conſider'd this Author's manner of Reaſoning, and attended him Step by Step to pag. 44 of his Diſcourſe, which, ſo far as relates to the Subject of War and Fighting, he ſeems to cloſe there, ſaying, " Thus I have run through the " moſt material Things that occurred to me on " this Subject: I requeſt a ſerious and impartial " Attention: If Truth be on my Side, acknow- " ledge it: If I am in the Wrong, convince me, " and I ſhall ever bear the Kindneſs in Memory: " I am a fallible Man, liable to miſtake, tho' free " to inquire and propoſe my Doubts. —— The " Liberty I have taken does not ariſe from any

" Pique

"Pique or Diſlike to the *Quakers*; but what I "aim at is honeſtly to exhibit to them what I "think is really their Error in Faith."

According to his Requeſt, I have ſeriouſly, and for ought I know, *impartially* conſider'd what he has alledg'd: I think, the *Foundation* of his Diſcourſe erroneous, and have given him my Reaſons for ſo thinking. I apprehend him to be in the wrong, and wiſh I may have convinc'd him of it: If I ſucceed not therein, yet my *Good-Will* in endeavouring ſo to do, being an Effect of *Friendſhip*, a generous Mind will not deſpiſe it. I am thoroughly ſenſible both of *his Fallibility*, my own, and all other Men's; and this *Senſe* of human *Fallibility* and *Impotence*, confirms me in my *Judgment*, that a *Power* of *Self-Preſervation* is not in Man, but that his *Rational Dependence* for *Preſervation* can only be, where *Certainty* and *Power* are united; viz. *in God alone*. If what he has written does not "ariſe from any *Pique* or *Diſlike* to the *Quakers*," I can aſſure him the Intent of this *Inquiry* is not to create any; nor to miniſter the leaſt Occaſion of Offence either to him or any Man.

As to the following Pages of his Diſcourſe, ſo far as they expreſs the *Excellency* of *Liberty of Conſcience*, and an Abhorrence of *Perſecution* of all Kinds, my Sentiments concur with his: I never think that *Truth* can ſuffer by *Freedom of Inquiry*; but in our Inquiries after it, we ought to have a ſpecial Regard to the Guidance of the Spirit of Truth, which God hath promiſed to thoſe who

who aſk it, leſt peradventure Self-Conceit, *Paſſion* or *Prejudice*, miſlead our Judgment, and incline us to embrace *Error* under a falſe Appearance.

I alſo acknowledge his *Juſtice* in expreſſing, pag. 48, the "hearty and honeſt Attachment of "the People call'd *Quakers*, to King *George* and "his *Family*, and to the Peace and Security of "the *Proteſtant Intereſt* in *general*."

His deſerved Applauſe, pag. 50, of the Excellent Prince and peaceable Government under which we live, and enjoy the ineſtimable Bleſſing of *Liberty of Conſcience*, I willingly ſubſcribe to; and have an high Eſteem and Honour for the Duke of *Cumberland*, aſcribing his Preſervation in the Midſt of Danger to the immediate Favour and Protection of the Providence of God, the glorious Deliverer of him and theſe Nations from Poniſh Tyranny and Arbitrary Power.

That which he acknowledges, pag. 51, "the "*meekeſt* and *pureſt* Minds to be moſt liable to im-"bibe, while under the mollifying *Influence* of a "*Goſpel Spirit*," he ſhould not ſuppoſe to be an *Error*; and I think, he does not right, in oppoſing the *rational Faculty* to that *Influence*; becauſe the *Dictates* of Reaſon, and of a *Goſpel Spirit*, do concur in teaching one and the ſame Doctrine; and the *meekeſt* and *pureſt* Minds are ever moſt ſuſceptive of what is ſo taught, and in leaſt Danger of falling into *Error*.

His Harangue, pag. 51, 52, againſt Bigotry, Superſtition, and a *blind Adherence* to Tradition, doth not at all diſpleaſe me, who have a profeſs'd Averſion to what he there exclaims againſt.

Nevertheleſs, I apprehend, we ought to be cautious, leſt an *Affectation* of Popularity, and an Ambition of ſeeming *wiſer* than our *Predeceſſors*, ſhould miſlead us to contradict their juſt Sentiments, and to deviate from their good Example.

I can agree with him, that "'tis Sincerity and "Integrity of Soul, that recommends good Men "of all Denominations to the divine Favour and "Acceptance;" and yet I can prefer *one Doctrine* to another, and am certain that two *contrary Doctrines* can't be *equally true*.

Thus have I attended him, as far as his Matter has *Relation* to the profeſſed *Subject*: Where he leaves that (*viz.* pag. 54) I take my Leave of him, and ſhall not interrupt him in "advancing *new* "*Speculations*," and deſcanting upon them at his Pleaſure.

A *Subject*, ſo ſublime and extenſive, as *the Peace of God*, which *paſſes the Underſtanding of Men*, muſt neceſſarily tranſcend the Reach of human Expreſſion: Nevertheleſs, 'tis a *Subject* exceeding ſweet and pleaſant, and in treating of it, methinks, I feel an *Enlargement of Heart* in

Fervency

Fervency of *Affection* to the whole Bulk of Mankind, and in *Chriſtian Love* recommend to All the Exhortation of the Apoſtle, enforced by a comfortable Aſſurance of the Divine Preſence and Protection,

Live, ſays he, *in Peace, and the God of Love and Peace ſhall be with you.* 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

F I N I S.

---

24 MA 59